



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1997

No. 23

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, gracious God, that our ears would be open to hear Your word, that our hearts would reflect the warmth of Your spirit and that our hands would be ready to do the works of justice and mercy. May we not, O God, become so busy with our own goals that we miss the wonder and beauty and truth and glory of our common responsibility to use Your gifts for justice in our land and freedom in our world. Bless, O God, all those who labor for these good works, that the bounty of Your word may be known by all. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 499. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service under construction at 7411 Barlite Boulevard in San Antonio, Texas, as the "Frank M. Tejeda Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 305. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Francis Albert "Frank" Sinatra in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions through his entertainment career and humanitarian activities, and for other purposes.

### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 305. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Francis Albert "Frank" Sinatra in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions through his entertainment career and humanitarian activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

### REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 539 AND H.R. 615

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to delete the following cosponsors from H.R. 539: Representatives TOWNS, MARTINEZ, FORD, and ACKERMAN. They were mistakenly added as cosponsors to H.R. 539 instead of H.R. 615.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to request unanimous consent to delete the following cosponsor from H.R. 615: Representative ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. He was mistakenly added as a cosponsor to H.R. 615 instead of H.R. 539.

Corrected cosponsor lists have been submitted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that during the joint meeting to hear an address by his Excellency Eduardo Frei, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his right and left will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, February 13, 1997, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0950

### JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, EDUARDO FREI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE

The Speaker of the House presided. The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Pamela Kidd, announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate taking the chair at the right of the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H671

Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency, Eduardo Frei, the President of the Republic of Chile, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY];

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY];

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER];

The gentleman from California [Mr. COX];

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN];

The gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY];

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR];

The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY];

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER];

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]; and

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency, Eduardo Frei, the President of the Republic of Chile, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES];

The Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK];

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD];

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN]; and

The Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM].

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Vice Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

The Vice Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Dr. Joseph Edsel Edmunds, Ambassador of Saint Lucia, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

At 10 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m., the Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the President of the Republic of Chile, His Excellency, Eduardo Frei.

The President of the Republic of Chile, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and personal pleasure to present to you His Excellency, Eduardo Frei, President of the Republic of Chile.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

# ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, EDUARDO FREI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE

(The following address was delivered in Spanish, with a simultaneous translation in English.)

President FREI. Mr. President, honorable Senators, honorable Members of the House of Representatives, officials of the United States Government, officials and members of my country's delegation:

I thank you for inviting me to speak here. It is an honor for me and for the people of Chile to address you in this Chamber which has stood for more than 200 years as an uninterrupted symbol of freedom.

I am deeply moved, not only because this House served as forum for Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and Abraham Lincoln, but also because it recognized the independence of Chile in the year 1810. It also gave strong support to the people of Chile in their struggle to restore democracy when it had been crushed, and to demand the observance of human rights when they were violated.

Don Quixote de la Mancha, addressing his inseparable companion, declared: "Freedom, Sancho, is one of the most precious gifts heaven bestows on man—all the treasure of the earth and of the oceans cannot equal it. For our freedom, as for our honor, we can and must risk our lives."

I am grateful for the example this Nation has given the world in its unwavering commitment to freedom. Few people know as you do the high and exacting price that must be paid to safeguard that precious value.

I want to share with you why we Chileans are ever more satisfied with the dividends of freedom, why we do not want to look back, why we wish to have a part in the new history, the history mankind is now beginning to write.

Chile is a small country with an unbreakable will to be. Our recent history shows that clearly.

Not long ago we seemed to be shattered by countless hatreds. But today we have built consensus and understanding. The strength of peace has triumphed over violence. We are seeking to understand and practice politics as the art of building and agreeing, not of destroying or paralyzing.

We have suffered setbacks, but today we consolidate our advances. Reconciliation among us has taken root because we have reclaimed our freedom to look to the future. We have known the generous pardon of those whose most sacred rights have been trampled. We have recognized our common heritage. We move forward knowing that today we enjoy the fruits of the energy and work of many generations of Chileans, not just those of any specific government.

In politics and in economics we have experienced extremes, rigidities and

dogmatism. Today we seek our own path to a development that is balanced, independent and creative. We do not believe in fixed models or miracles but in creativity and in the courage to make changes.

We have not attempted everything at once. We know that great initiatives have been defeated by asking for too much too soon. We want sustained, legitimate progress, even if the pace is slow. We know there is much to be done to make our democracy strong and resilient, but we want to move forward surely and safely.

We have learned to be patient. Chile does not begin anew with each election. Rather, we build on our creativity and our work. We are well aware that we have a unique historic opportunity to achieve full development in a free market of political freedom. We value our achievements, but we give equal attention to the challenges ahead of us.

Neither have we sought an easy bonanza. Instead we have chosen sustained growth. We have not promoted ephemeral advances but those based on the work and real effort of the people of Chile. We have not relied on miracles, but, rather, in hard, unflagging work.

Today we have a stable economy that benefits the people: 14 years of sustained growth at a rate that has averaged 7 percent annually over the last decade; a rise in real annual wages of over 4 percent; our per capita income doubled in a decade; savings rates close to 25 percent; 5 consecutive years of fiscal surplus. We hold international reserves sufficient to sustain a year of imports of goods and services. Productivity has grown almost 5 percent annually in the last 6 years. Our unemployment rate is close to 6 percent.

We have resisted the temptation of easy promises. Our message has been frank and society has responded with discipline. Even while many of society's pressing needs remain unsatisfied, the conduct of our people has been exemplary.

We seek today to resolve the age-old dilemmas of the State and the market, the private and public sectors. Both seek to be more effective and to offer services of higher quality in their respective capacities.

Our people want no more paternalism. They are ready to forge their own destiny. They want the tools for progress. That is why my government has assigned education its highest priority. We want all elementary and high schools to have a full school day. We are devoting greater resources to develop a high quality teaching corps and modern educational institutions so that every region of the country can have centers of excellence in public education. We want total investment in education to grow from 4.5 percent of GNP to 7 percent within a period of no more than 8 years.

The State is also making a direct effort to help the poorest, earmarking 70 percent of government expenditures for

social spending. One million six hundred thousand Chileans, or 11 percent of the population, men of flesh and blood, have moved out of poverty over the past 6 years.

We are undertaking a profound modernization of the management of public services to increase the quality and coverage of services to the people. We are carrying out the most far-reaching reform in this century of the administration of justice to make it more accessible, flexible and equitable.

In the health field there are two systems, one public, the other private. We have created a system of private health care with standards comparable to those of the most developed countries. Some 30 percent of our population participates in that system. More Chileans will join that as the country continues to grow. At the same time we are working on a complete overhaul of our public health system. We are making it more efficient, broadening coverage and improving quality. We have undertaken a massive investment in health infrastructure and introduced reforms in management methods and decision making, improving the quality of care. International health care indexes show that we are on the right track.

In the area of social security we have established a system, and I know that this is a principal concern to many Members of this Congress, that has grown strongly over time. In the early 1980's Chile replaced its pay-as-you-go system with a private plan based on individual contributions. Pension funds are administered by private institutions chosen by individual workers on the basis of their profitability and the security they provide for individual savings. The amount deposited today equals 40 percent of GNP and is diversified in the broad investment portfolio. Profits have averaged 12.2 percent annually since its inception.

To modernize our productive infrastructure we are opening up the way to private investment in the construction of highways and modernization of railroads, airports and ports. We work together in those areas so that our infrastructure can match our growth and extensions of our economic frontiers.

Any objective, impartial observer must recognize the energy and dynamism that runs through Chile. People of Chile have left despair behind. We are worked hard for our progress and to solve our problems and broaden our horizons.

With peace at home we can take a new look at the world. To this Congress, I bring the voice of a people who want to participate in mankind's new hopes.

We have suffered the great dilemmas of mankind. For decades we have paid with our own flesh for the polarization of the cold war. We are aware that we have left the culture of conflict and division behind. A new world based on cooperation and freedom lies within our grasp. Chile wishes to leave behind its traditional isolation. We are a small

country at the southern edge of the world that seeks to participate actively in this new era opening up to mankind.

The struggle for human dignity in this century has had millions of anonymous heroes and victims. We do not want this universal suffering to have been in vain. Perseverance in the promotion of democracy and human rights throughout the world is the most fitting tribute we can give those who suffered totalitarian barbarity and genocide.

Chile will persevere in that path. Last year it promoted a wide-ranging debate on democratic governance that culminated in the Declaration of Vina del Mar, signed by presidents and heads of state of Ibero-America. That undoubtedly constitutes a landmark in the increasing efforts to consolidate democracy throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. Chile wants the torch of liberty to shine in every corner of the globe.

We are actively committed to world peace. That was our objective when we were elected to temporarily chair in the United Nations. That was our role as guarantor in the conflict between Peru and Ecuador, and that is why we participate actively in United Nations peace operations. Today we are in the Middle East, Iraq and Kashmir. We will soon be sending police forces to Bosnia.

We also encourage peace through mutual confidence-building measures and by signing international agreements to prohibit chemical, biological and mass destruction weapons, as well as to prohibit nuclear testing and to create denuclearized zones. Chile wants peace to be proclaimed decisively on the threshold of the coming century.

The promises of peace, liberty and cooperation of this new era must be ensured. Today neither Hitler nor Stalin threaten us. A threat comes from the drug traffickers who sap the energies of our youth and enrich themselves by poisoning our people. We are threatened, too, by terrorism that acts in the dark, without compassion, without reason, against the innocent, acting in the name of politics, religion or race, leaving frequently a wake of impotent grief around the world.

In our country and beyond we have engaged in the decided battle against those scourges. Therefore, in compliance with our own legislation, we are establishing procedures for judicial and police cooperation and coordination in addition to broadening bilateral and multilateral conventions on this subject. Chile wants to cooperate actively to make our world a safe place.

We believe also that the democracy is illuminated when honesty and transparency characterize public office and political activity. Those displaced by democracy hope corruption will weaken faith in democracy. Let us not allow economic power to buy political power or the latter to establish questionable relationships with economic power. We are alert to the need to safeguard the

longstanding and honorable tradition of honest public service in our country, especially in a time of economic growth. We are updating our national legislation and have participated actively in measures our region is developing, such as the Inter-American Convention on Corruption and others. Chile wants clear and transparent politics and business.

We step into the new century with the knowledge that the universal habitat of humanity is fragile. When forests disappear, the destiny of nature and our own are one and the same. We have an inescapable responsibility. Future generations have a right to material progress, but they have a right also to a healthy environment. Chile is taking appropriate measures. We have renewed and updated our legislation so that all planned production is subject to environment standards. We have launched a massive plan to clean up urban pollution and to set aside almost 19 percent of our territory as state-protected forest. Chile is going to cooperate responsibly in caring for our planet.

We have a commitment to free trade. These are not mere words. It is entirely consistent with our development strategy and opening our economy in the generation and exploitation of new competitive advantages and in our entry into numerous new markets.

Twenty years ago Chile exported to 50 countries. Today it is 152. Where before we had 200 exporters, now we have 6,000. Before we exported 500 products. Today, 4,000. Seventy percent of our GDP is linked to foreign trade.

We have diversified that trade. Of our total trade, Asia, including Japan, represents 24 percent; North America, 22 percent; Latin America, 23 percent; and Western Europe the remainder.

Our Congress voted unanimously in favor of the Uruguay Round agreement of the GATT and for joining the World Trade Organization. With that political mandate, we have developed our policy of open regionalism, including nearly 30 bilateral agreements for economic cooperation. With most of the countries in Latin America and the regional bloc we have signed free trade agreements. Negotiations to establish a free trade agreement with Mercosur, were successfully concluded in June, 1996. Today that regional bloc is the third largest economic bloc in the world and the one that offers the best prospects for growth. Chile has also seen a significant increase in Chilean foreign investment. In 1996 alone, Chile invested over \$6.3 billion abroad in our neighboring countries.

In April of 1996 we concluded a new economic framework agreement with the European Union, signed in Florence at the European summit of heads of state in Florence. Another important milestone in our economic progress was our joining APEC, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation forum in late 1994. We have signed a free trade agreement with Canada based on the NAFTA

rules in November 1996. Next month we will open conversations with Mexico to review the free trade agreement currently in effect.

When we speak of free trade, we speak from experience and with ideas and practice. We speak from a country that changes daily, and it is becoming a platform for trade, a gateway to Latin America, where a significant trade flow is just beginning.

In that context our trade negotiations with the United States are of great interest to us, and we believe that they should advance to higher levels. As an individual country the United States has some 20 percent of our foreign trade, is our principle trading partner. In the last 2 years alone that trade has grown by over 50 percent. The United States enjoys a favorable trade balance of \$1.5 billion with Chile.

Investors are our chief foreign partners, with 45 percent of total foreign investment in Chile. We are particularly proud of the joint enterprises undertaken by American and Chilean firms in our country as well as in other Latin American countries, and even in the United States itself.

Because of this promise and relationship we accepted with enthusiasm the invitation in December 1994, at the conclusion of the Miami summit, the invitation from three NAFTA partners. Before this Congress, let me reaffirm our interest in those negotiations. We consider complete trade liberalization between Chile and the United States a natural step as well as an encouraging signal in the task of achieving free trade in the Americas, a process in which both our countries are engaged.

In recent years we have witnessed a unique historical process. An unprecedented number of countries sought to establish democratic regimes and economic integration with free trade as the common denominator.

Chile embraces this course and works to promote it actively. We hope it will not be as difficult to initiate free trade talks as it was so often to initiate peace talks during this century. Delays today could mean the weakening of many democracies, resurgence of closed markets and the consolidation of hunger and migrations in many corners of the world.

Honorable Members of Congress, my presence here symbolizes a new era in friendship with the people of the United States. We wish to leave fears and distrust behind. We know that we live in a precious time, an opportunity we must not squander, a time between two historical processes. We are neither an economic nor military power, but we want to be a part of the history that is unfolding. Allies in the solution of the most pressing problems that confront us all, partners in furthering freedoms, brothers in the promotion of peace and democracy.

We do not wish simply to move from a world of ideological confrontation to one of economic competition. We do not want a soulless world. We must be

sure that the new history we write together is one of cooperation, creativity, change for the good. We know that globalization is not guided by compassion or solidarity. We know it has two faces, one desirable and the other is not. It is our responsibility and our task to make it right, to make it just, and not to blame it for our ills.

Economic and political change is never easy. The temptation of short-term profit can turn significant numbers of businesses and workers into enemies of the future. Some politicians and voters resist any change that crosses their interests. However, we know that change is not possible without new actors emerging, without a new distribution of political and economic power. It is for that reason that we aspire to strong democracies and economies with opportunities for everyone.

In March next year, our country will hold the Second Summit of the Americas. Before long, the population of the Americas will exceed 1 billion. Our combined revenues will be more than \$13 trillion. Let us turn the page on our fears, our wars, and our distrust. Let us leave the days of threats and sanctions behind us. Frank and open dialogue is the instrument of international democracy. The principles and values we share must be our only parameters.

It is crucial for us to write a new page in the history of the Americas. It is a page of confidence in the future, a page of mutual understanding, a page of free trade, a page free of hunger, a page of democracy, a page from Bolivar and Jefferson.

In concluding, I wish to say that throughout our shared history, many, many Latin American presidents have come to this country. Traditionally, the success or failure of those missions has been measured in concrete assistance and contributions that each president has garnered from this country. With great ease, on behalf of my country, I wish to say to you today we have not come here to ask for anything. On the contrary, we come to extend to you an invitation to invite you to a shared undertaking.

Let us travel together down a path that includes, but is not the only, classic form of economic cooperation. Let us together build a vision of the future for this hemisphere, a political, social, scientific, cultural future based in our roots and our history.

Over the last few days I have heard with pride and gratification of the praise of the progress that Chile has made in recent years. It is true that we have come far. It is the truth of the work of generation upon generation of Chileans. But we know in our hearts that the principal obstacle and challenge to us must be to overcome extreme poverty, and there is no more valuable legacy that we can leave to future generations than to eradicate this ill that besets so many of the people of Latin America; to speak to those who have suffered from hunger of democracy have nothing.

Let me finally on this very privileged occasion share a personal thought with you. When my father held the same office that I hold today, so many of the United States and the Americas shared a great dream of the future. It was the Alliance for Progress. The world has changed dramatically since that time. What has not changed is the need to again have an American dream for the coming century. The dreams of individual nations may change in the details, but what is truly important is that you and we share the ethical and moral underpinnings of such a dream.

I have said repeatedly that Chile has an historic opportunity. Many times in our history we have stood at the threshold of development and we have squandered those opportunities as we did late in the last century. That is our responsibility today as political leaders, to move forward with the people of Chile, to make progress with our hemisphere, to make that dream a reality, to be capable of building in Latin America a solid democracy, overcoming poverty, opening our markets to the rest of the world.

If we have strength, courage, and political resolve, we can build that dream, we can achieve that dream, and that is the task before us, and I call upon the people in the United States and the Congress to work with us toward that dream. Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m., the President of the Republic of Chile, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Vice Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

#### JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until the hour of 11:45 a.m.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska] at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 332, nays 38, answered "present" 2, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—332

Aderholt	Cunningham	Hilleary
Allen	Davis (VA)	Hinojosa
Armey	DeGette	Hobson
Bachus	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Baesler	DeLauro	Holden
Baker	DeLay	Hooley
Baldacci	Diaz-Balart	Horn
Ballenger	Dickey	Hostettler
Barcia	Dicks	Houghton
Barr	Dingell	Hoyer
Barrett (NE)	Dixon	Hunter
Barrett (WI)	Doggett	Hutchinson
Bartlett	Dooley	Hyde
Barton	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Bass	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Bateman	Dunn	(TX)
Becerra	Edwards	Jefferson
Bentsen	Ehlers	Jenkins
Bereuter	Ehrlich	John
Berman	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Berry	Eshoo	Johnson (WI)
Bilbray	Etheridge	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Evans	Jones
Bishop	Everett	Kanjorski
Blagojevich	Ewing	Kasich
Bliley	Farr	Kelly
Blumenauer	Fawell	Kennedy (MA)
Blunt	Flake	Kennedy (RI)
Boehlert	Foley	Kennelly
Boehner	Ford	Kildee
Bonilla	Fowler	Kilpatrick
Borski	Fox	Kim
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Kind (WI)
Boucher	Franks (NJ)	King (NY)
Boyd	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Brady	Frost	Klug
Brown (FL)	Furse	Knollenberg
Bunning	Gallely	Kolbe
Burr	Ganske	Lampson
Burton	Gejdenson	Lantos
Buyer	Gekas	Largent
Callahan	Gibbons	LaTourette
Camp	Gilchrest	Lazio
Campbell	Gillmor	Leach
Canady	Gilman	Levin
Cannon	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)
Capps	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Cardin	Goodlatte	Livingston
Castle	Goodling	LoBiondo
Chabot	Gordon	Lofgren
Chambliss	Goss	Lowe
Chenoweth	Graham	Luther
Christensen	Granger	Maloney (CT)
Clayton	Greenwood	Manton
Clement	Gutierrez	Manzullo
Coble	Hall (OH)	Markey
Coburn	Hall (TX)	Mascara
Collins	Hamilton	Matsui
Conyers	Hansen	McCarthy (MO)
Cook	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Cooksey	Hastert	McCollum
Cramer	Hastings (FL)	McCrery
Crane	Hastings (WA)	McDade
Crapo	Hayworth	McDermott
Cubin	Herger	McGovern
Cummings	Hill	McHale

McHugh	Price (NC)	Snyder
McInnis	Quinn	Solomon
McIntosh	Radanovich	Souder
McIntyre	Rahall	Spence
McKeon	Riggs	Spratt
Meehan	Riley	Stabenow
Meek	Rivers	Stearns
Metcalf	Roemer	Strickland
Mica	Rogan	Stump
Millender-	Rogers	Stupak
McDonald	Rohrabacher	Sununu
Miller (CA)	Rothman	Tanner
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Tauscher
Minge	Roybal-Allard	Tauzin
Mink	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Mollohan	Ryun	Thomas
Moran (KS)	Salmon	Thornberry
Moran (VA)	Sanchez	Thune
Morella	Sandlin	Thurman
Murtha	Sanford	Tierney
Myrick	Sawyer	Torres
Neal	Saxton	Towns
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Traficant
Neumann	Schaefer, Dan	Turner
Ney	Schaffer, Bob	Upton
Northup	Schumer	Vento
Norwood	Scott	Walsh
Oliver	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Ortiz	Serrano	Watkins
Owens	Sessions	Watt (NC)
Oxley	Shadegg	Watts (OK)
Packard	Shaw	Waxman
Pallone	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Pappas	Sherman	Weldon (PA)
Pastor	Shimkus	Wexler
Paul	Shuster	White
Paxon	Sisisky	Whitfield
Pease	Skaggs	Wise
Pelosi	Skeen	Wolf
Peterson (MN)	Skelton	Woolsey
Petri	Slaughter	Wynn
Pickering	Smith (NJ)	Yates
Pitts	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Pomeroy	Smith, Adam	Young (FL)
Porter	Smith, Linda	
Poshard	Snowbarger	

NAYS—38

Abercrombie	Gutknecht	Pickett
Bonior	Hefley	Pombo
Brown (CA)	Hinchey	Ramstad
Clyburn	Hulshof	Rush
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
DeFazio	Kucinich	Stenholm
English	Lewis (GA)	Taylor (MS)
Ensign	Maloney (NY)	Thompson
Fazio	Menendez	Visclosky
Filner	Nussle	Waters
Foglietta	Oberstar	Weller
Gephardt	Parker	Wicker
Green	Pascrell	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Obey Regula

NOT VOTING—60

Ackerman	Doyle	Moakley
Andrews	Engel	Molinari
Archer	Fattah	Nadler
Bono	Forbes	Payne
Brown (OH)	Hefner	Peterson (PA)
Bryant	Hilliard	Portman
Clavert	Inglis	Pryce (OH)
Carson	Istook	Rangel
Clay	Kaptur	Reyes
Combest	Klecza	Ros-Lehtinen
Condit	Klink	Sanders
Cox	LaFalce	Schiff
Coyne	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Danner	Latham	Smith (OR)
Davis (FL)	Linder	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Stokes
Deal	Lucas	Talent
Dellums	Martinez	Tiahrt
Deutsch	McKinney	Velazquez
Doollittle	McNulty	Weygand

□ 1207

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I announce that I was necessarily absent from rollcall vote 28. On that vote, I would have voted "aye."

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 636

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 636, which I authored.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 26, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,

U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for the opportunity to serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. It is my intention to respectfully request a leave of absence from the Banking and Financial Institutions Committee so I may be able to concentrate my District's interests on both Transportation and National Security.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

J.C. WATTS, JR.,

Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Messrs. MANZULLO of Illinois, SANFORD of South Carolina, THORNBERRY of Texas, DOOLITTLE of California and MCCRERY of Louisiana.

## CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 105-48)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a

notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on February 24, 1996, is to continue in effect beyond the March 1, 1997, to the Federal Register for publication.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 1997.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain 1-minute requests.

#### NEWLY PROPOSED EPA STANDARDS REGARDING PARTICULATE MATTER AND OZONE

(Mr. NEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, our Governor today came out with a bipartisan delegation from Ohio and met with Members on both sides of the aisle on an important issue, and that is the ozone and EPA regulations.

On February 6, George Wolff, chairman of the EPA's own Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, testified the proposed standards were based on a policy judgment by Carol Browner, the director of the U.S. EPA, and not on sound evidence.

What do we find out today? The L.A. Times story. And in that story it says that the White House complained, in a draft report made available Wednesday, that a major air pollution proposal put forward by the EPA was not fully considered and based on what some scientists consider inadequate research.

What does the EPA say? If unchanged, the report could be very damaging. Of course it could be damaging, because this is a hallucination by the Director of the EPA of what our standards could be. It will put us out of work. It will put us out of work in the Midwest of this country.

This is not based on scientific fact. Information has been withheld from the committee. Chairman BLILEY requested additional information.

Take the trigger off the gun, Director Browner. We want our jobs.

□ 1215

#### HEALTH INSURANCE FOR CHILDREN

(Ms. DEGETTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a topic that is close to all of our hearts, children's health. Like many of my colleagues, I am blessed with two healthy children, but 10 million parents in this country have little or no access to health care for their children. And, worse, more and more of these uninsured children are being exposed to environmental hazards that render horrible illnesses with no cure.

As Congress works to improve health coverage for children, I urge them to promote policies that promote health care for children, especially remediation of environmental hazards. Today, children live in an environment that is vastly different from those of past generations. While all children are exposed to environmental health hazards, children living in poverty are at a disproportionate risk.

Survey after survey shows that toxic waste dumps, lead paint and high pollution are most often located in or near low-income neighborhoods. With limited access to health care, children exposed to environmental hazards face multiple risks of illness, including asthma and lead poisoning.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to address in a serious way health care for children.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRANT HITS JACKPOT

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss an issue which has raised both the anger of my constituents and now the eyebrows of many of my colleagues who thought that we had finally put an end to the handing out of benefits to illegal aliens with last year's immigration and welfare reform bills.

I am talking about an illegal immigrant who hit the jackpot of the U.S. Treasury. The San Diego Union reported that an undocumented woman residing in my hometown received \$12,000 in taxpayer funds to move out of her apartment complex to make way for a HUD project. Legal residents in that same project received displacement costs of \$400, but the illegal alien gets \$12,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is not only crazy; it is unbelievable and since every Federal agency must comply with the Uniform Relocation Act, who knows how often this is happening. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it not only defies common sense, this is a cash reward for beating the system.

Yesterday I introduced legislation to close this loophole by amending the

Uniform Relocation Act so that it abides by and enforces the immigration law as we have passed. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue which has raised both the anger of my constituents and now the eyebrows of many of my colleagues who thought that we had finally put an end to handing out benefits to illegal aliens with last year's immigration and welfare reform bills. I am talking about an illegal immigrant who hit the jackpot at the U.S. Treasury.

The San Diego Union Tribune reported on February 12, 1997, that an undocumented woman residing in my hometown of Ocean-side, CA, received \$12,000 in taxpayer funds to move out of her apartment complex to make way for a HUD project, Department of Housing and Urban Development project.

The crazy thing is, HUD knew she was undocumented, not to mention unemployed, and that is why she received so much. Other residents of the complex were moved to section 8 public housing without compensation. Because illegal immigrants are prohibited from living in section 8 housing, HUD went ahead and gave her \$12,000 in relocation assistance.

How could this happen? Apparently, HUD claimed it was just following the Uniform Relocation Act, which mandates that residents displaced by a Federal project who do not receive alternate housing, such as section 8, must be financially compensated—without regard to immigration status.

Legal residents in my district displaced by this same project will receive a subsidy of about \$400 for their section 8 housing. But an illegal alien gets \$12,000? Mr. Speaker, that is not only crazy, it is unbelievable. And since every Federal agency must comply with the Uniform Relocation Act, who knows how often this happens? Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this not only defies common sense, this is a cash reward for beating the system.

I should also mention that the Immigration and Nationalization Service has yet to take the appropriate steps to deport this person. They know her name, her previous address, and they need to go no further than HUD to find out where she is now.

Yesterday, I introduced legislation to close this loophole by amending the Uniform Relocation Act so that it abides by and enforces the immigration laws of this Nation. HUD may have found the door open just enough to award this woman \$12,000, but I intend to slam that door shut, for good.

I urge the support of all of my colleagues for this legislation. Simply put, it's the right thing to do. Continuing such an absurd policy is unacceptable.

#### CHILDREN AND HEALTH INSURANCE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, over 70,000 children in my home State of Connecticut woke up this morning without any health insurance, and tonight their parents will lie awake, worrying, knowing that they are one phone call, one accident away from medical and potentially financial ruin.

As we come together from both sides of the aisle to work on areas of common ground, surely we can agree that

providing health care for our children must be a top priority. Yesterday the Democratic leaders asked the majority leadership to move the expansion of health care coverage for children to the top of their legislative agenda. There are 10 million reasons why we must do this, for the 10 million children in this country living without health insurance.

If there is one thing the American people are counting on us to do, it is to make the world a better place for their families, and we cannot have healthy families without healthy kids. We need to make health care work for all of America's children. We must take this issue, make it a top priority, in this new session of the Congress.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT APPEARS DOOMED

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, by any measure of public opinion the balanced budget amendment is one of the most popular political issues in America today. But sadly, because some politicians believe that it is perfectly acceptable to say one thing at home and do another in Washington, DC, we have a situation where the will of the American people will be thwarted once again. This is the kind of thing the American people have come to loathe about Washington, DC. This is why they threw out the last majority in 1994, because they were tired of seeing politicians say one thing and do another.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very sad day today. The balanced budget amendment has wide bipartisan support in this body and in the Nation as a whole. But as long as the American people keep sending Representatives and Senators to Congress who do still believe in honor, who do still believe in trust and who do still believe in telling the truth, we will eventually have a balanced budget amendment.

#### "SCHINDLER'S LIST"

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about some of the inappropriate actions of some Members of this House. I cannot begin to fathom why someone watching the Academy Award winning "Schindler's List" on television the other night would choose to focus their attention on the harsh language or the images depicted in the film rather than the horrifying message of that film.

Yes; an apology was given, a little late I might add, for the Holocaust is one of mankind's worst moments in history and the importance of telling

this story to the widest audience possible is what happened the other night. Those of us with compassion and feeling understood that history cannot be repeated. Only by retelling the story can we prevent millions of innocent victims from losing their lives again. The story of man's inhumanity to man should have been the focus, not someone's prurient interest in this great film.

Mr. Speaker, some apologies come too late and are disingenuous in light of what was said. I think we need to understand where these insensitive comments come from, just as we understand where the comments came from yesterday about the Branch Davidians and David Koresh were innocent victims. They were not. They raped young women.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this pattern does not continue. I think this House needs to get on with the right kind of business, the people's business.

#### THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT AND POTOMAC FEVER

(Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it looks as though the balanced budget amendment once again is going to fall victim to the disease that we see way too much of here in Washington, DC, a disease that you might call Potomac fever. How do you know if you have Potomac fever?

Well, if you have wobbly knees or are weak or of faint heart, you might have Potomac fever. If you have a sudden urge to break a campaign promise, then you definitely have Potomac fever because that is what we see all too much of here today.

This disease is not restricted to a particular party or a particular issue, and the effects are devastating not only on a politician's career, that is OK, but also on the sort of legislation that we can enact in this House.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately with the balanced budget amendment, the lesson is very clear. The American people support this amendment, our country needs this amendment so we can get our budget in order. But because of Potomac fever, it looks like we are not going to get it again this year. That is a shame, Mr. Speaker. I hope we can do it again next year.

#### KIDS HEALTH CARE

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to help the 10-million-plus children in the United States who do not have health insurance. Together we can help families help themselves by providing parents with a tax credit that will enable them to purchase health insurance for their children. When you really think about

it, the current situation is unconscionable; 10 million uninsured children have to rely on emergency room treatment instead of their family doctor for treatment; 90 percent of these uninsured children have parents who work, but their employers do not provide health coverage for their children.

Mr. Speaker, I think about the parents who lay awake each night wondering what they will do if their kids get sick. Caring for your children is perhaps the most basic human instinct and, as things stand now, millions of hard-working parents are having trouble providing health coverage for their children.

We can help. Soon I will cosponsor a plan that requires insurance companies to provide kids-only health plans with tax credits to help families pay the premiums. I believe this is something Members from both sides of the aisle can agree on. It is not a new program. It is a program to help our children.

#### SUPPORT H.R. 636 TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN EXECUTIVE BRANCH FUNDRAISING

(Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to alert my colleagues to the importance of H.R. 636. This legislation, which is bipartisan, would prohibit from this moment forward, once adopted, the fundraising at the White House, the Vice President's residence or any of the retreats that are in the executive branch.

We need this to restore confidence with the public when it comes to campaign fundraising and as well this area of executive fundraising. We already have restrictions here in the House and Senate on any fundraising in the Capitol. The same should apply at the White House.

We passed last year the gift ban. We passed last year lobby disclosure reform. Now we need to have campaign finance reform. And H.R. 636 will be a great part of campaign finance reform by making it off limits to sell any part of the White House for fundraising, soft money or any other kind of political fundraising. I appreciate the support of my colleagues and look forward to its passage.

#### HEALTH INSURANCE FOR CHILDREN

(Mr. BLAGOJEVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, as a new father I can think of nothing more important than the health of our children. It is immoral that 10 million children in this Nation do not have the comfort and protection of health insurance.

In my State of Illinois, there are almost a half million children without



health insurance. Many of their parents cannot afford to send them to doctors or dentists for regular checkups. In fact, doctors never see half of uninsured children with asthma or one-third of those with persistent ear infections.

The answer is clear. Congress should encourage the creation of affordable kids-only insurance plans. Right now the United States is the only major industrialized Nation whose children do not have a guarantee of health insurance. With 10 million of our children endangered without insurance, think about it; 10 million American children have no health insurance. What does it say about us if we fail to act?

#### A LEGACY OF DEFENSE CUTS

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the President's defense budget is now in, and he continues to slash national security. He has cut the Army from 18 divisions, that is what we had during Desert Storm, to 10 divisions. Cut it almost in half. He has cut our air power from 24 fighter airwings to only 13. He has cut air power almost in half. He has cut our Navy from 546 ships, that is what we had during Desert Storm, to only 346 ships.

Mr. Speaker, this President wants a legacy, but if we endorse his budget on national security, his legacy will be that he is the President that left us unprepared for war.

#### EXPANDING HEALTH INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN CHILDREN

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as a father and also a Member of this body, I rise to add my voice to those leaders of my party who yesterday called upon the majority to work in this session toward expanding health insurance for American children. When we know that 10 million American children have no health coverage, I wonder why the majority leadership of this body needs to be asked to make this pressing need for American families a priority.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is changing and unfortunately too many new jobs do not offer health insurance for workers' families and workers' children. Ninety percent of these uninsured children's parents work. I was proud to participate in the introduction of the families first agenda last year when I was a candidate for this office. That agenda addresses the real needs of our families and if made into law would make health coverage available to those families. Those are the priorities of the people of the Ninth District of Texas and that they elected me to fight for. It may not be popular inside the beltway but if we want to rebuild the

trust of the American people in this institution, those are the priorities both parties should share.

#### PASS BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I love children. I have two children myself, and I enjoy listening to politicians try to use children for their own political gain, especially when it smacks of hypocrisy. Some politicians in Washington love children so much that they go to them first when they want to steal their money. This country is in debt to the tune of \$5.5 trillion and guess who Senator KERREY's commission, a Democrat, said was going to be paying for that \$5 trillion?

□ 1230

Senator KERREY's commission says by the year 2020, because of the \$5.5 trillion deficit, our children will pay 89 percent of every dollar they earn to taxes to the Federal Government.

Now if these people really love children, they can pass a balanced budget amendment, get rid of Potomac fever; stop promising one thing at home, coming up to Washington DC, doing something else, and start allowing our children to have the same American dream that each one of us was able to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass it now.

#### CHILDREN'S HEALTH CARE

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Democratic leadership's proposal to add children's health care to the priorities we address this session. Today more than 10 million American children have no health insurance coverage.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the New York Times reported that over the past 5 years the number of children without insurance has risen twice as fast as the number of adults. Most of these are the children of working families earning between \$15,000 and \$45,000 per year. In my State the Maine Health Care Commission estimated that in 1996 36,000 Maine children had no health insurance coverage, and 91 percent of Maine's uninsured children live in families with at least one working parent.

Ten million American children relying on emergency room treatment instead of a family physician is wrong and expensive. We can and must do better. This Congress should encourage kids-only insurance policies and expand basic Medicaid coverage to uninsured children.

#### PASS THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as a father of four children I certainly share the concern that so many people have expressed about our children. That is why I am hoping that many Members on that side will join us in the passage of a balanced budget amendment.

As we know, yesterday, because of the New Jersey Senator, the balanced budget appears to be dead in the U.S. Senate. But, as my colleagues know, if we are going to balance the budget we have to have that constraint. It is the same constraint my colleagues and I have in our households; it is the constraints that parents have when they are saying no to their children who want more of this and more of that.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] mentioned earlier that if we continue on the path we are on, our children will have a tax rate of 89 percent just to maintain the present level of goods and services in America.

While I know there are Members of the House who want a brand new entitlement program, I think it is very important that we look at what are we going to do for tomorrow's children. If we want to help the children of tomorrow, we should not enslave them with an 80- or 90-percent tax burden. Reach out to them and let them share in the American dream so that they can go out and help another generation.

#### INVESTING IN THE HEALTH OF OUR CHILDREN

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to also challenge my colleagues to begin to think that we as a Nation have an opportunity to say that our children indeed are important, not only as we want to use them to talk about the balanced budget or use them to talk about education. But when it is said, really when one thinks of how a society reacts, it is how it takes care of its children. Surely, surely, the health of our young people is equally as important as the opportunity for them to pay taxes.

Their health indeed may mean that we may pay less taxes if we invest early. Recent reports have indicated that if we take care of our children early in their life, not only their carpentry skills but their health skills and education skills are better. And, therefore, if we invest in our children we have an opportunity not to have such severe health costs later in life.

So investing in our children is not a Democratic issue, it is not a Republican; it should be an American issue because we care about our children.



Mr. Speaker, I hope the 105th Congress will seriously consider what we can do to make sure the lives of our children are more healthy than they are now.

#### SOLVE THE HEALTH INSURANCE CRISIS

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, like so many of my other colleagues, I am deeply distressed that we continue to live in a country as wealthy as the United States of America and we continue to have 10 million of our children without health coverage, 1 in 7 children in this Nation with no health insurance. Tragically, 9 out of 10 of these children live in families with working parents, but they earn too little to provide health insurance, not only for themselves but in many instances for their children.

There was a time 10 years ago when children were covered by employers, when children were the responsibility of families working. But today as we see a downsizing of jobs, a downsizing of benefits, a downsizing of hours, employers are walking away from families in terms of health insurance, and they are certainly walking away from the children in those families that need health insurance. Since we debated health insurance issues, a million more children in this country are without that health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, we did not solve the health insurance crisis in this country by failing to deal with it. We owe the children of America a much better due.

#### BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS ON HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN IS NEEDED

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I too today rise to urge this Congress to take action to make sure that the 10 million children in this country who are not covered by some form of health insurance get covered. Surely this is something on a bipartisan basis Republicans and Democrats alike can reach consensus and agreement on.

Because many of the cases in West Virginia, for instance, where the General Accounting Office listed 40,000 uninsured children, quite frankly I think it is more than that, but in many cases these are the children of parents who play by the rules. They get up every morning, they drive to work, they get their kids off to school, they pay their taxes, they obey the laws. They do everything right, and yet the thing that grips their gut the most is that they do not have their children covered with health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, that is something this Congress can rectify. We can argue

about a whole lot of other things, but there are ways to do this. This Congress needs to make sure that the 40,000 children in West Virginia and the millions of others across this country and their working parents get their due, and that is health insurance.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1997

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1997

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 3, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 4, 1997, for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SHEPHERD COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak on two topics today. First, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish a happy anniversary to Shepherd College in Shepherdstown, WV, just about an hour and 15 minutes drive from here. Today Shepherd College celebrated its 125th anniversary with the ringing of the town bells that occurred at noon today. This is going to kick off a year of celebration. Although I cannot be at the school today to share in this mo-

ment, I felt that this occasion warranted special recognition.

Shepherd College is located in Shepherdstown, WV, on the banks of the Potomac River. It is the oldest town in my State and its history runs deep. Shepherdstown has watched its young men march off to participate in each war in this country, beginning with the Revolutionary War. It witnessed James Rumsey's demonstration of the steamboat two decades before Robert Fulton. Shepherdstown also served as witness to the bloodiest day of the Civil War, the Battle of Antietam, which was fought less than 5 miles away.

Shepherdstown has indeed experienced a lot in our Nation's history, but perhaps its proudest accomplishment has been the founding of Shepherd College. Shepherd College was established in 1871, when the county seat of Jefferson County was moved from Shepherdstown back to Charles Town. The people in and around Shepherdstown decided to use the vacated courthouse for a private college. A year later, in 1872, the West Virginia Legislature passed an act establishing a school for the training of teachers in Shepherd College.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago Shepherd College consisted of 1 building and 20 students. Today its campus entails over 20 buildings and approximately 4,000 students. The campus has grown from one single lot in 1871 to over 161 acres of land today.

As the college has grown, so has its importance, not only to West Virginia but to our Nation as well. Shepherd College alumni live in all 50 States of our country.

I am proud to represent such a fine institution in this congressional district. Over the years I have had an opportunity to work with both Shepherd College, its administration and its students, and I have always been impressed with the level of dedication they all feel to this school. I wish Shepherd College, its president, David Dunlop, its alumni, its faculty and staff, and certainly its students, every possible success in the future, and congratulate them as they celebrate their 125th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to speak briefly today on the matter of the Air Force expanding its overflights into West Virginia and parts of Virginia. And indeed it has been good to work with Congressman GOODLATTE of Virginia, Congressman RAHALL, and the Senators from each of our States as we have dealt with the Air Force in trying to get them to review and reconsider their proposal to greatly expand their number of training flights in the military operational area to include eastern West Virginia and parts of Virginia.

The fact of the matter is that in a meeting just last week the Air Force conceded that they had not done the proper environmental assessment. They conceded that they had not taken

public opinion into proper review, and that they would now do the proper environmental assessment.

Many of us have great reservations about the economic and environmental impact of increasing from 66 flights a year to over 2,200 training flights, some only 300 feet above the mountainous terrain, the impact that this would have on our very prosperous poultry industry and livestock industry. There are additional impacts, as well.

The Air Force also has conceded that it did not do a good enough job in communicating with the public, and indeed it did not, and that they will be, shortly, announcing meetings to occur in Pendleton County and presumably in Virginia, as well. Indeed, I will be meeting today with representatives of the Air Force to press this case.

The reality is, the best proposal would be one in which they either revisit the whole idea completely, or actually reject it and consider expanding the training flights they are doing in the existing training area where it has long been conducted.

□ 1245

So for these reasons, I hope that the Air Force will continue to look at this, to reevaluate. Certainly we have pushed off any effective date significantly. It does call for a fair environmental assessment. It does call for public opinion and public comment. Most importantly, it calls for a complete review and reconsideration of what I consider to be an ill-founded proposal, and I will work to see if we can get the Air Force to agree with that opinion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wolf] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### TAKING ISSUE WITH COMMENTS MADE BY FELLOW MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in my 5 years at this House I have very rarely come to the well of this great body to criticize the comments of one of my colleagues. I have great respect for the bipartisan and diverse views of all Members of this House, and their right to express the views and concerns and ideas of the people they represent in their respective districts.

But once in a while, a Member of this House makes a comment that is so irresponsible and so outrageous that I simply cannot remain silent. Yesterday one of my colleagues from Texas, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PAUL] made a statement that I feel is so irre-

sponsible that in good conscience I simply cannot remain silent.

In his statement on C-SPAN's Washington Journal yesterday Mr. PAUL said this:

I fear and there are a lot of people in this country who fear they may be bombed by the Federal Government at another Waco. I mean, these people committed no crimes.

Mr. Speaker, it is astounding to me that a member of this Federal Government, a Member of this Congress, would say publicly that he fears being bombed by the Federal Government. My fear is that kind of statement made by a public official of this Congress simply expands the hysterical paranoia of those around this country who might be hiding in their closets thinking that the Federal Government is somehow going to bomb them in the sanctity of their private homes.

I think that is sheer lunacy, at best. At worst, it could create and engender the kind of hatred toward our Federal Government that leads to tragedies such as that we all sadly witnessed in Oklahoma City.

Second, as the Member of Congress who represents Waco and the Waco area, and as someone who watched and followed very carefully the proceedings and the tragedy of the Branch Davidian compound, I must say that I am astounded that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL], a Member of this House, would say, despite all of the facts on the table, would suggest that the Branch Davidians and David Koresh committed no crimes.

At best, that is flat wrong and denies the fact and reality. At worst, it is a misrepresentation intentionally of what was done there.

Let me say what the facts were. The facts were that David Koresh raped a 10-year-old girl. We heard that dramatic testimony of that girl, now 14, just a few months ago in the Halls of this House.

Fact: The Federal officials who went into that compound found 48 illegal machine guns and illegal hand grenades.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] that the possession of 48 illegal machine guns and illegal hand grenades, I would suggest rape, arson, and murder are a crime in the book of every American family, if it is not a crime in the book of the gentleman from Texas.

I think these statements, Mr. Speaker, deserve a response to the people of Waco, to the people of Mr. PAUL's district, and to the people of this country. I would like to hear him explain his comments that he lives in fear of the Federal Government bombing him, and I would like to hear him explain how, despite all of the clear facts, the facts that the Branch Davidians lit the fires that killed, tragically, those children near Waco, I would like to hear him explain away those facts.

Instead of saying, perhaps I made a misstatement, or I apologize for what I said, or I did not intend to say that,

when Mr. PAUL responded to my response yesterday in the Houston Chronicle he accused me of McCarthyism. Mr. Speaker, I hardly believe that saying that arson, rape, and murder is a crime in this country is anything close to McCarthyism. He went on to defend his contention that the Davidians had committed no crimes.

I would challenge the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL], to meet with me in the well of this House during special orders and let us debate this. I believe good people of good will, both Republicans and Democrats alike, who look at the statements of the gentleman from Texas will see that they were irresponsible and dangerous to have been made by a public Member of this House.

#### SALUTE TO THE BIG 10 CHAMPION MINNESOTA GOLDEN GOPHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota Mr. RAMSTAD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long, hard winter in Minnesota, with record cold temperatures and snowdrifts so high they obscured barns and houses. But last night, the University of Minnesota men's basketball team warmed the heart of every Minnesotan as the Golden Gophers won their first Big 10 Conference Championship since 1982.

Minnesota, hats off to thee.

Today, we salute Coach Clem Haskins and his 1997 championship team as well as the assistant coaches, managers, training trainers, and the best fans anywhere in the Nation. We are Big 10 Champions and proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, last fall none of the experts picked our Golden Gophers to win the title, but they persevered. They won the close games. They personified teamwork. They fought back. They stuck to the game plan. They listened to their coach, Clem Haskins.

One night this week, Coach Haskins told the story on the local television news of running into a woman in his neighborhood grocery store. This woman was accompanied by her young son in a wheelchair. Clem could hardly speak as he recounted that woman's words to him in that grocery store: "Your basketball team has totally captured my son's attention," she said. "The Gophers have inspired my son to walk one day."

Fighting back tears, Coach Haskins told the reporter: "That's really what the world is all about, if you can give people some hope."

Coach Haskins, you and your team have given us hope, and a whole lot more.

Under Clem Haskins' guiding hand, this marvelous mix of young men has rewritten University of Minnesota basketball history:

The first Big 10 title in 15 years, only the third conference championship in the past 60 years;.

A school record for the number of victories in a single season, 25 wins, with three regular season games and the NCAA tournament remaining.

The school's highest national ranking ever, No. 2 in both major polls.

The best road record in memory.

Undefeated at home, in the "Barn", our beloved Williams Arena.

And, if justice prevails, a No. 1 seed in the NCAA tournament.

Coach Haskins, now in his 11th season at Minnesota, has mentored hundreds of true champions. Not all of them have won Big 10 titles, to be sure, but they have been winners in the classroom and they have been winners in our community.

Coach Haskins, who served as assistant coach of the 1996 men's Olympic basketball team, has assembled a very special group of young men in this championship season. They all deserve a tribute for the way they came together to surprise the experts and win the Big 10 title.

All Big 10 guard Bobby Jackson, who ranks among the big 10 leaders in steals, assists, scoring, free-throw percentage, field-goal percentage and rebounding.

Minnesota's other guard, Eric Harris, the defensive specialist and most improved player on offense, to be sure; Eric provided the steady leadership only a 3-year starter can.

Minnesota's own Sam Jacobson, a constituent of mine, one of the great natural talents, with the long, arching outside shots which broke open so many close games. And John Thomas, another native Minnesotan, of the inside force, whose key rebounds and clutch free-throws also won so many nail-biters this season.

The other big man in the middle, Courtney James, a major factor in this glorious title run, with his strong rebounding and scoring in the paint when we needed it the most.

But perhaps the team's greatest asset, Mr. Speaker, is its bench, the players who accept their backup roles and come through in the clutch: Quincy Lewis, with his amazing shooting touch; Trevor Winter of Slayton, MN, with his rebound and baseline jumper; sophomore Charles Thomas, a southpaw whose specialty is the 3-point bomb, and who always comes through when we need it the most; Miles Tarver, another sophomore whose leaping ability ruled the boards when the other players' legs had tired; freshman guard Russ Archambault, who provided fans with many thrills with his speed, ball handling, and his slashing style on the court; also Jason and Jermaine Stanford and Aaron Stauber, who work so hard every day.

Yes, Coach Haskins, you and your team have put Golden Gopher basketball back on the map. Congratulations, Minnesota, on winning the Big 10 Championship, and best of everything the rest of the way. Go, Gophers.

### INTRUDER DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Navy honors the retirement of an old friend, the A-6 Intruder. Attack Squadron 196 and Attack Squadron 75 will stand down the final two Intruder squadrons in simultaneous ceremonies at Whidbey Island, WA, and Virginia Beach, VA, respectively.

As the backbone of carrier attack aviation for the past 36 years, the A-6E Intruder stood ready to deliver its formidable payload in any weather, day or night. The A-6 put teeth in the term "carrier forward presence." It saw combat in Vietnam, Lebanon, Libya, in the waters of the Arabian Gulf, and over the shores of Kuwait and Iraq. It delivered iron bombs, laser-guided bombs, and every air-to-ground missile available in the Navy inventory for the past three decades.

The Intruder was never the prettiest plane on the flight deck, but it was always the hardest working. The pilots and bombardier/navigators who flew the Intruder affectionately referred to its Grumman ironworks origin. Some swore the aircraft was made of solid steel. Whether the shells and missiles it faced flew from Hanoi or Baghdad, many an A-6 returned to the carrier full of holes, but ready to see combat soon after a few steel patch jobs.

We also honor the thousands of Intruder maintainers, both past and present, who kept this 18-ton bombing machine flying day and night, at sea and ashore. Foreign terms such as fly-by-wire and heads-up display never passed the lips of these hardworking men and women. Metal, pulleys, oil, and hydraulic fluid kept this archetype of attack airborne.

Finally, let us remember the Intruder crews who never returned. In service to our Nation, they paid the ultimate price flying this machine that they loved. We miss them still, and will never forget them. From this day on, the Navy must continue to carry on the spirit of Intruder attack. Whenever the Navy rolls in hot, a bit of Intruder history rolls in with it.

### EXERCISING COMITY ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I am a little out of breath because I had to run down to the floor. I witnessed, as I was watching my television, what was going on on the floor, a very unfortunate situation, and had I been here I would have probably attempted to take down the words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS]. He was attacking another gentleman from Texas. I think it is really unfortunate.

Particularly if one Member is going to use the name of another Member, it is usually comity on the floor of the House to at least inform that Member that you are going to talk about him on the floor of the House, and give that Member the opportunity to respond to what is going on.

I feel that what is going on between the two gentlemen from Texas is unfortunate. I would hope that particularly on the eve of trying to bring comity to the House and the Members going to Hershey, PA so we can bring a little bit better discourse to the floor of the House, getting to know each other, that we would find it within the courtesy afforded to each Member to at least talk to the Member.

□ 1300

Now, I do not know, all I have seen is the reports in the press on this incident. But I would just hope, I see the gentleman from Texas is on the floor now. I appreciate him coming down to the floor of the House because I did inform him that I was about to talk about him. I just ask the gentleman from Texas to realize the tradition of the House and the courtesy of the House, to extend the courtesy to a Member, let him know that you are going to talk about him before you are going to come down to the floor.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion. I think the distinguished whip, for whom I have great respect, knows that in my history in the House, I have not been the type of Member that has gone out and taken gratuitous partisan shots. I am one who will attend the bipartisan retreat and am encouraging other Members to do that. I want to bring civility to this House. But I must in all honesty say to my friend from Texas that, as the Representative that covered or represented the people of the Waco area to whom the Branch Davidian tragedy is a very deep and personal issue, I simply could not sit back and quietly accept the statement that was made yesterday. And I found out about and saw the tape last night, the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL], lives in fear that the Federal Government is going to bomb them similar to Waco and that these people committed no crime. I would welcome the opportunity to talk to Mr. PAUL and encourage a public debate on that.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the gentleman, did the gentleman call Mr. PAUL to ask him about the context with which that statement was made? Or did the gentleman just go out and make statements based upon what he saw in the press? Or did the gentleman from Texas see the program on which the words were spoken by Mr. PAUL? The reason I am close to the Chamber is we were having lunch,

and Mr. PAUL was very disturbed that the gentleman from Texas had made these kinds of comments. He left the lunch to go call the gentleman from Texas so that you get together and talk this out. As we were leaving the lunch room, we found that the gentleman was down in the well of the House attacking one of his colleagues from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas is watching now, I would welcome him to come to the floor of this House. I will be glad to stay here.

I think this is an issue that should receive a public debate. I think the public has a right to know why he fears the Government is going to bomb him and why he thinks David Koresh and his Branch Davidians committed no crimes. He may be offended by what I said in response to his comments. I am more offended by what he said. I think rape, arson, and murder are very serious crimes. I did see the program before I made the comments.

Mr. DELAY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is a friend of mine. I think it is unfortunate that we are even having this conversation. Because at least the Texas delegation has always been able to speak to each other privately. And if they could not resolve their differences, they always, they could take the opportunity of going to the press very seldom. In fact, I do not even remember in the 12 years I have been in the House that a Member from Texas attacked another Member from Texas from the well of the House. I appreciate the time.

#### PATENT TERM RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, just to add a little bit or shed a little bit of light on this, we have a wide diversity of opinion here in the House of Representatives just like in the United States of America. We have a wide diversity of opinion. That is one of the great strengths of the United States of America.

I see my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], over there. We have a lot of disagreements, but we know that we can respect each other's opinion even though we have some mighty differences of opinions. I happen to agree, interestingly enough, I happen to agree that some of the things that happened in Waco, TX, and some of the actions taken by the FBI have been very questionable and indeed would make honest people worry some about what is going on in the FBI. Expressing that should be no reason, and for other people to sort of think that that is sort of an oddball opinion. That is not an oddball opinion at all.

I think we can respect each other, for I know that some people have come to

me from the minority communities over the years and have expressed to me that law enforcement is attacking them in a different way than they would be attacking people in the majority Caucasian community. I have to admit some of the times I have dismissed some of those criticisms. But I will have to admit also that there are some things that have happened in recent years that have sort of given me a different point of view to take some of those charges a little more credibly and to listen to them and to think maybe there is something to these criticisms.

So let us hope that in things as volatile as this, where life and death matters are being discussed, we do maintain a civility.

One major issue that is going to be happening here in Congress and we are involved in right now deals with the patent issue. I am fighting a major fight along with 50 other Members of the House who have cosponsored my bill to maintain a guaranteed patent term for the American people and to ensure that our patent rights are not diminished in order to create some global trading system. Some people want to create a global trading system at the expense of the rights of the American people because they think everybody is going to be better off because of it. That is their point of view.

The American people better understand that we have got these globalists who are trying to eliminate the right, certain patent rights that the American people have enjoyed since the founding of our country. H.R. 400 is a bill that is coming through Congress right now, I call the Steal American Technologies Act, which greatly diminishes the patent rights of the American people and thus in the long run will make America technologically inferior, undercut our prosperity, and our national security.

Our technological superiority is what has made us a prosperous and secure country. I am asking my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 811, which is my bill to restore the patent rights of the American people, and to oppose H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, which, among other things, get this, H.R. 400 does this: mandates that every patent application, whether it has been issued or not, will be published for the entire world to see after 18 months.

That means every copycat, every one of America's competitors and adversaries will have every one of our secrets, all the details. They will probably be into production of our new technology ideas even before the patent is issued to our own inventors. This is lunacy.

Yes, some people have a right to the other opinion because maybe it is a good thing in order to create a global market, but they are trying to create a global market over the well-being and prosperity of the American people and diminishing the rights of the American people. I ask my colleagues to join me

in supporting H.R. 811, the Patent Term Restoration Act, and opposing the Steal American Technologies Act, H.R. 400.

Mr. Speaker, I believe when the American people understand this move by the multinational corporations to diminish our patent rights in order to create a global marketplace, the people will rise up. They will call their Congressman and they will call their Senator to ensure that, if you want a global market, do not do it by diminishing the guaranteed rights we have had since the founding of our Nation and that has ensured us to be the technological leader of the world.

This is a big fight. It is the little guy versus the big guy. But also when we have a debate like this, it is important for us to sit down here and slug it out on the issues. In this particular case, should we have a guaranteed patent term, H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, says no. Should we have the right of confidentiality so when a man submits a patent, whether it is confidential, H.R. 400 says no, they are going to publish it for the whole world to see.

Should we have a strong working patent office as part of our Government, which H.R. 400 would corporatize.

Defeat the Steal American Technologies Act, H.R. 400. Support H.R. 811, the Patent Term Restoration Act.

#### BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of both the balanced budget and the balanced budget amendment. It is important to distinguish between those two subjects because often in our debates in the House, we confuse the two.

We really are talking about two individual issues. First, are we going to have a balanced budget? Second, are we going to write in the Constitution the obligation of the Federal Government to do what virtually every State in this country has to do, and certainly every family in this country must do?

I was touched a few minutes ago by the litany of speeches from my colleagues on both sides when the subject of children was brought up. As the father of two 4-year-old twins who are sitting at a television set not too far from this Chamber listening to their father's maiden speech on the floor of this House, I certainly am very proud to be a dad, and am moved as a policymaker to do what is good for my children and the children of our country. But as proud as I am to have my 4-year-olds able to watch me as a Member of the House address this body today, I take no pride in the fact that on the day they were born 4 years ago,

they inherited almost \$175,000 in taxes that they will have to pay over their lifetime as their portion of the national debt. This is because we have failed as a nation to balance our budget.

Children born today and children born tomorrow will have an even higher amount of debt that we will impose upon them if we fail in our obligation as policymakers.

What is the effect of this great debt that we keep accumulating year after year? The effect is that more and more of our tax dollars that could be going for important services such as public safety, hospitals, infrastructure, Medicare, Social Security, and some of the key programs that we support on a bipartisan basis, will be drained. A greater percentage of what we send to Washington is going to go to pay the interest on the debt rather than to serve the people that we have been elected to represent.

I heard a number of speakers a few minutes ago in this body talk about the fact that our national debt today is over \$5 trillion. I suspect there are very few Members of this body who know how many zeros go after the "5" to make so great a number. But here is a very cogent example: If a person opened a business on the day that Christ was born almost 2,000 years ago; and if their business skills were so terrible that on that first day they lost \$1 million; and if every day thereafter they lost \$1 million to the present day, we would not even hit 1 trillion dollars.

Yet we as a nation are now laboring under almost \$5.5 trillion worth of debt. What does that mean in real terms? It means that every single day that the sun rises on this building, the American taxpayers are forced to pay \$750 million in interest on this burgeoning debt.

One of the bipartisan things we have been able to agree on is that we will balance the budget by the year 2002. If we pass a balanced budget in this Congress, we will not have a balanced budget in 1997. We will not have one for 5 more years.

As of today, America has not had a balanced budget in 28 years. Now we are talking about having our first balanced budget after 33 years.

What would it take for us as a nation to pay off this debt? We would not only have to have a balanced budget, we would have to balance it to the point where we had a \$200 billion surplus. Not for 1 year, not for 2 years, but for almost 30 years.

We have not balanced the budget in almost 30 years. We would have to not only balance it, but have a huge surplus every year for 30 years to pay down this debt. And I use that example just to accentuate how much we owe as a nation and how we cannot continue to allow this debt to cripple our children's and our grandchildren's future.

We owe it to future generations to be responsible. We need to pass a balanced Federal budget. To insure it remains in balance,

we need to place that obligation in the Constitution. This is why I rise in support of these two worthy measures, and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting them.

□ 1315

#### REPORT ISSUED ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Dr. John Brademas, has issued a report on the condition of the arts and the humanities in this country. I want to thank Dr. Brademas and the committee and the support they have received from President and Mrs. Clinton for this very thoughtful, excellent report.

Truly, the strength of our country is dependent on the way we engage education and the way we give responsible cultivation and stewardship to the arts and the humanities. I urge that this report be taken seriously and that Congress give proper support to two superlative agencies, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I think that our vitality as a Democratic society, as a learning society, is dependent upon the respect we exhibit for our cultural arts, our literature, our historic records and the other products of the creative spirit. I commend Dr. Brademas and the committee for this report and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support its recommendations.

#### HEALTH INSURANCE FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of years congressional Democrats have been focusing their attention on addressing some of the most important health care challenges facing this country. Last year Congress took a small but important step in the right direction when it passed the Kennedy-Kassebaum health insurance reform bill. Because of that bill, citizens who change jobs will continue to receive health coverage, insurance companies may no longer deny individuals health coverage when they switch jobs due to preexisting medical conditions.

Although congressional Democrats were happy to see Republicans join us in passing this important piece of legislation, we did emphasize at the time of the bill's passage that we believed much more needed to be done. And as a result of this belief and as a result of the GOP's refusal to consider any other health issue other than portability,

Democrats immediately set about to build on the momentum the passage of the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill created by pushing for legislation that would make health care available to every child in this country.

There are now about 10 million uninsured children in the United States. To combat this problem, Democrats incorporated a children's-only health care plan into their family-first agenda. The plan was not only developed because Democrats believe our children deserve better health care, it was developed because of the recognition that today it is increasingly harder for even those parents with jobs to secure health insurance for themselves let alone for their children.

Unfortunately, we have not made any progress on this issue because the Republican majority has refused to allow our plans to move forward. We are 2 months now, 2 months, into the 105th Congress, and the Republicans who are the majority do not have anything of major importance for the Congress to consider. Unlike Democrats and the President, they do not have a plan to ensure that all children have access to health care nor do they appear to have any intention of letting our plan move forward.

The American people sent us here to develop legislative solutions to societal problems, such as providing health care to uninsured children. Every day we waste is a day another sick child goes without health insurance and we cannot continue to let this happen for moral as well as financial reasons.

A couple of days ago I brought the House's attention to a report that was issued by the New York City public advocate, Mark Green. It basically talked about the growing number of New Yorkers who are living without health insurance.

I know today that I am joined here on the floor with one of my colleagues from New York, Mr. SERRANO. The report, as the New York Times put it, quote, is filled with disturbing information that has implications for the entire country.

We are going to be talking with my colleagues from New York and from Texas about this report this afternoon. And although it does deal with New York City, I need to stress that the phenomena and the conclusions and findings that it comes to really apply all over this country, to every State and every city.

With respect to children, the report found that between 1990 and 1995, the proportion of uninsured children in New York City rose 6 percent. In 1990, 14 percent of children had no health insurance. By 1995, that figure was 20 percent. One out of every five kids in the largest city in the country has no health insurance.

Overall, the report found that the number of uninsured children under age 18 in New York City rose from 277,500 in 1990 to 323,800 in 1995, a one-sixth increase, more than twice the increase in the adult population.

The trend is particularly distressing when it is recognized that not only was Medicaid expanded during the same period to include more children, but that New York State has an insurance program for children as well. Its own insurance program. And despite that, the number of uninsured children continued to increase.

This report underscores the need to expand, not decrease, the accessibility of health care to children. In short, it underscores what congressional Democrats have been saying since last year: that portability is good but it is not enough. We need to build upon the Kennedy-Kassebaum amendment by adding a children's-only health program.

Before we can do that, I have to stress we must convince the Republicans to let us move forward. Yesterday, Democratic leaders DICK Gephardt and TOM Daschle sent a letter to the Republican leaders NEWT Gingrich and TRENT Lott once again asking them to join the Democrats on making progress on this issue.

I think the New York City public advocate's report illustrates just how important it is to begin the process of passing a children's-only health bill. Considering nothing, which is what we are doing here every day, day after day, and adjourning, in this case today at 12 noon, especially with the problem growing, as plans to confront it sit on the shelves collecting dust, I believe, is irresponsible and inhumane.

I hope the Republicans accept our invitation to move forward and deem the issue of providing health care to our children worthy of congressional attention. I do not think it is too much to ask and I, for one, and I know my colleagues will continue to be here every day over the next few months until we see the majority take some action on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to yield to my colleague from New York, Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. SERRANO. First, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for putting together this special order today to discuss such an important issue.

I must say, as the gentleman has well pointed out, this is a very disturbing situation, disturbing because on this floor we take great pride, and we should, on a daily basis, in the fact we live in the country we do live in. With that, we understand that there are some problems we have yet to solve, but there are some basic problems that I think we should have solved a long time ago, and for some reason we continue to have these problems.

Lately, these problems have been compounded by the fact that there is a feeling that somehow if you are not getting certain care in this country it is your own fault; that you somehow created this problem on your own. After all, what we have been hearing lately is if you are poor, it is because somehow you do not get off the chair and do something about your problem.

Well, now we are talking about children specifically in this report. Chil-

dren are at the mercy of their society. We are in this society what we do for children. That is who we are. We are people who either take care or do not take care of children. And we have a report that says that there are that many children throughout the Nation, 10 million American children according to the chart that is next to the gentleman from New Jersey, 10 million American children.

Now, what is interesting about that statement is it does not say 10 million children throughout the world. That is bad enough. It does not say, which would be also very bad, 10 million children in the Third World countries, the underdeveloped countries, 10 million children in one country, it says 10 million American children. And yet, as the gentleman states, we cannot get our colleagues on the other side to move on the issue of full coverage for all children.

Now, this problem not only affects children, it affects the whole family. We hear a lot these days about family values, about how families should do for themselves. Well, there are some things that families cannot do for themselves. No family, except for maybe one-half of 1 percent in this Nation, can pay the amount of money it takes to go into a hospital or to get health care. That is why we have insurance companies. And that is why we have insurance plans, and that is why we have government subsidized plans.

When we have 10 million children, and that many children, a figure that continues to go up in New York City and other places throughout the Nation, that are not insured, we have a serious problem that affects the whole family.

Picture, if you will, the next study, which should be of all the children that are not insured; how many, because of related issues to not being insured, miss X amount of days from school? How many of those children are attending school in physical conditions that they should not be in? What is that doing to their ability to learn; to read and write, to do their work? What effect does that have on the family; the tension in a family? How many families have to worry about money in this country and that strains their relationship at home? How many have to deal with problems of drug addiction and that strains the relationship at home?

Perhaps one of the studies should be how many of the families that are not insured, how many of the families who have children that are not insured have this extra added strain on their relationships in the home? And so to speak about family values, and to allow 10 million children to be uninsured, is really something that is hard to fully understand.

One last point before I turn the microphone back to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, every time that we speak in these Chambers, and on so many talk shows throughout this Na-

tion our elected officials make public statements, we seem these days to want to attack people from certain communities. As I said before, one of the communities we attack is the poor. This one should be an easy one. This one should be one that no one should be politically uptight about.

I do not know a community in this country that would be upset if Congress tomorrow did something about insuring children. If a community got upset, then there should be a study about what is wrong with that community. There cannot be an American family who would want for a neighbor's child anything less than the basic health care needs that they would want for their own family.

So I would hope that today's special order begins to put forth the notion that there are some things that we do because they sound good politically, and there is opposition we take on issues because it is a good political stance. But this is good for our country, this is good for humanity, this is good for children; and we should attack this problem soon and attack it like we have attacked no other problem.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and I particularly appreciate when he began and talked about this notion that I think we do hear down here from time to time, that somehow it is your own fault. In other words, the reason why you do not have health insurance or the reason why your children do not is because it is your own fault and you have not done something about it.

I think this New York City report by the public advocate really belies that, because it points out that the overwhelming majority of the uninsured, not only children but adults, everyone, are working people. And that, in fact, many of them are, or a significant percentage, are actually working in large corporations.

So these are people that are working. These are people, in some cases, that are working more than one, two, or even three jobs, and yet their employer does not provide the health insurance and they do not have the option because they cannot afford the health insurances.

Quickly, and I am quoting from the summary of this New York City report, it says the majority of uninsured New Yorkers work. One-half of New York City's uninsured residents between the ages of 18 and 64, because, of course, after 65 you have Medicare, they had full-time jobs in 1995. And among uninsured 35 to 53 years old, 62.8 percent were employed full time.

Interestingly enough, again the uninsured are employed in both large and small companies. While nearly 30 percent of New York City's uninsured workers were employed in companies with 10 workers or less in 1995, a large percentage, 22 percent, had jobs with companies with a thousand or more employees.

So the bottom line is what is happening not only in New York but across

the country is that more and more people, even if they work for large corporations, they simply have taken away health insurance and they are not providing it to their employees. So this is something that is happening across the board for working people primarily. So that whole notion about it is your own fault is just not the case.

I want to yield now, Mr. Speaker, to the gentlewoman from Texas, who I know is very concerned about children's issues in general.

□ 1330

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey and I appreciate his leadership. I am delighted to join my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], speaking about some extremely important issues, because I think the value of our special order and this discussion is to indicate how far reaching this problem is. We are talking about New Jersey and New York, and I am 3,000 miles away in Texas and have discovered that this problem is extremely prevalent in the South and in the West.

But we need to put a face on this question, so that we can say to those of us who have the responsibility to address the 10 million children that are uninsured, we must put a face on this issue and we must frankly say to those who would stall this very important issue, you can run but you cannot hide. And I say that because there is a face to this.

Angela Pollatos of Washington Heights in northern Manhattan is typical of those who have lost insurance in the last 5 years. She was cited along with this New York City report. Her husband is a painter who made \$30,000 last year. This is a working family. His company, however, does not offer health coverage. How many Americans can tell us that same story time after time after time? Are they taxpayers? Yes. Are they homeowners or renters? Yes. Are they paying their bills? Yes. But do they have health coverage? No.

Three years ago when Mrs. Pollatos was working the family bought private insurance through a Government subsidized program. Remember, now, bought, was not given. But the premiums are rising quickly and when she stopped working after the birth of a son, the family could no longer afford the program. Now, someone is probably saying, "They didn't budget, they didn't put their moneys together."

I want you to be able to understand. They tried buying insurance but were discouraged; \$500 a month was the cheapest insurance. This is a young family that is trying to survive on \$30,000 a year, living in, I know what my colleague might say, certainly in a State that has certainly increasing costs and responsibilities, but these are working people and you can see that and they could not afford \$500 per month, and I think that is important.

When we begin to look at the insurance, or the uninsurance if you will, of

our American children, we do not have to point to the east coast, we do not have to point to the west, we can point to the United States of America. You can find uninsured children throughout the United States. This is a global problem, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] has said, but it is certainly a national crisis when 10 million children are not insured. And you can look at Oregon and Montana, you can look in Louisiana or Alabama, Mississippi. In Texas alone, 1,352,894 children are uninsured. These children are under the age of 18.

And so we really have a key responsibility to move forward. Sixty percent of the insured children have a parent working full time. More than 90 percent of uninsured children live in families without working parents. Let me correct that. Sixty percent of the uninsured children have parents that are working. This is truly a responsibility that I think must be heard throughout these Chambers.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] and I were talking today about the responsibilities we have to our constituents. We were discussing legislation that we were drafting on behalf of our constituents. I think it is important that as the agenda moves through term limits, I do not know how many citizens are concerned about that, some other issues that seem like they are not having the success of being placed on the agenda of the floor of the House, would it not be very simple to immediately begin hearings, immediately begin putting on the floor of the House the legislation that is so important to be able to stem the tide of this tragedy? Ten million uninsured children.

Let me also emphasize something that I think might have been highlighted earlier by the speakers. Hispanic children comprise a disproportionate share of uninsured children. Over 25 percent of Hispanic children are uninsured, along with 15 percent of African-American children and 11 percent of white children.

I say that not to separate us but to bring us together, to realize that for some folk who may have been thinking it is not me, I do not have to worry about it, this attacks all of our children. We do not have the numbers for the emerging and growing Asian population, but certainly we realize that that is growing as well.

Twenty-four percent of New Yorkers have no health insurance, up from 20.9 percent 5 years ago. The proportion of New York City's children who are uninsured rose to almost 20 percent in 1995, up from 14 percent in 1990.

It is important, as I said, to note that we have real problems in the South and the West, but this report out of New York was very eye opening. It is important to note that about 22 percent of the uninsured work for companies with more than 1,000 employees, contradicting the conventional wisdom that large companies usually offer comprehensive

benefits. Fewer than one-half of New York City residents now have private health insurance, and most uninsured families in New York make between \$15,000 and \$45,000 a year.

When I was in local government, one of the things that saddened me was our inability to serve our children. This number in Texas would be higher if I gave you the numbers of those who were not covered by Medicaid and also those who could not get the basic, what we call well care coverage. What does that mean? Most of us recognize that a child does not date or time his or her illness. So they could be 5½ or 6 years old, you can be sure you will be taking them to the doctor.

Well, we were faced in local government with eliminating what we call well care coverage for our children, meaning that children who were dependent on Government assistance could not see the doctor past age 5. We had no money to give anyone so that these children could go and have regular appointments beyond the age of 5. We call that well care treatment for our children, preventative health care.

I want Americans to understand that when we uninsure 10 million children, what that means is that we open ourselves up to epidemics, we open ourselves up to a contagious outbreak, we open ourselves up to not being able to prevent children from having the diseases that would interfere with their education and their quality of life.

So I would simply say that we have a challenge today. We have an administration proposal that proposes \$3 billion a year to provide health insurance coverage, but it covers only 5 million children. We want to move forward on that. But I want us to recognize that we have 5 million children left that we must address as well.

I certainly will be supporting and working with the proposals that have been offered that cover 5 million children, to work to ensure that 13-year-olds, 250,000 of them eligible for Medicaid for the first time, are covered.

We want to bring down teenage pregnancy, I think that is extremely important. We want to extend health insurance coverage for 6 months to unemployed parents, and we also want to make sure that we find all the children that are not on Medicaid, to make sure that that occurs.

I simply want to say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], in terms of the importance of this issue, that the question of timing is important. Every day that we waste, this map will never change. This map continues to reinforce the lack of insurance, the lack of accessibility of medical care for our children. Let me simply raise a question with you.

As we fought so hard last year to stop the drastic and draconian cuts of Social Security, or SSI, I am facing right now in my district numbers of single parents whose children received SSI for a number of disabilities. They could have been autistic, they had ailments that categorized them as being



mentally challenged. Those children right now do not have services. Uninsured children likewise face not having the appropriate counseling services, not dealing with some of the mental illnesses that face our children, that could be treated to give them a better quality of life.

My question to you is how much more do we have to document? How many of us will have to continue to confront these tragedies in our community? How many of the members of the New York community, this family that I have just mentioned, Pollatos, who did not have the dollars to pay \$500 a month, will have to continue in order for us to be able to come to a bipartisan approach, and I would like it to be bipartisan, dealing with the 10 million uninsured children of working families, poor families, that do not have the ability to access health care?

My question to you is, where are we going, and how many times will we have to rise to the floor, how many numbers and statistics will we have to give? I see my good friend from New York who is certainly aware of these problems, how much longer will we have to tolerate this condition for our children?

Mr. PALLONE. Let me say, and I think that basically our colleague from New York has addressed this, that I think the problem with the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, is that they are following this philosophy that somehow it is the people's fault, it is their own fault.

If you are faced with these overwhelming statistics that show you not only that there are 10 million American children that have no health insurance but that the numbers continue to grow every year and it is working people who are trying to make ends meet, the only conclusion I can draw is that you somehow, and I think many of my colleagues on the other side have convinced themselves that somehow it is not something that they can deal with, it is the people themselves that have created the problem. There is just no truth to that, no basis to that.

One of the things that is most upsetting to me, and I will mention it briefly and then maybe yield to the gentleman from New York, is that when the Republican leaders of both the House and the Senate met with President Clinton just a few weeks ago to try to come to agreement on priorities, even though the President said emphatically in his State of the Union address and provided in his budget message to provide for a program that would cover at least half of these 10 million children and said he wanted action on that in this Congress, the Republican leadership refused to make that one of their priorities, so that these task forces or groups that were set up to try to move legislation through Congress on a bipartisan basis do not include children's health insurance, do not include the President's proposal, because the Republicans said that that was not a priority.

So clearly we are not getting the message out, and we need to. We need to make our colleagues on the other side understand that this is a most important priority but we are not there yet.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. One of the interesting things about this whole issue is that as my colleagues know, in many instances on these kind of issues the leadership comes from the White House, sort of emanates from the White House, and Congress reacts to it. In the past the White House did not speak, prior White Houses did not speak the issue of health care coverage.

This White House did, and it was ridiculed for a plan that some people did not agree with. But the intent, rather than negotiating the plan, the intent was to stop the whole notion of coverage, universal coverage for everyone. And so now we find out that because of that lack of action and the inability to follow up on the family values agenda, which also should deal with this issue, you find, for instance, that the number keeps growing. A few years ago the number we threw around was 34 to 36 million Americans were not covered. The figure being dealt with now is 40 million Americans.

I would also like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey to tell me if I am wrong on this issue, because he has been excellent on the issue of finding a fair immigration reform program in this country, and coming from New Jersey and coming from New York and from Texas, immigration is an issue. But is it immigration reform with a heart, immigration reform without a heart? Am I correct in suggesting, and I ask the gentleman to comment on this, that as we move to take benefits away from legal immigrants, we are now going to increase that number that we see on this chart above the 10 million children, or are those figures that we are dealing with these days already taking into account the possibility of all these folks that will be taken off the benefits, incidentally in many cases, for people who are interested, when you talk about people under 65, you are not talking about people who were here for the last 20 years, worked, paid taxes, and so one issue seems to jump on top of the other one. Am I correct that this will actually increase these numbers?

Mr. PALLONE. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. For example, in referencing the New York City report, I would take note of the fact that the last year that we were making reference to was 1995, well before any of these changes in the laws with regard to immigration would take effect. So there is no question that taking more people off the rolls as a result of those immigration policies would impact the numbers and create more uninsured.

I would also suggest, again here I am speculating, that a lot of the problem

is not even reported. In other words, the figures that our colleague from Texas is looking at on that map have to be based on some reporting that was actually done, and I would suspect that there are a lot of people, legal or otherwise, people that were born in the United States, who simply do not even get reported, so I suspect that the figures are much larger and there is no question that they are growing.

Mr. SERRANO. The gentleman is absolutely right. I happen to know for a fact in my district that the poorer the person, the less likely they are to get counted in the Census. The Census does not speak about anything other than counting people who live within this country.

□ 1345

So if that is true and we know that is a fact, then the gentleman is right. The numbers there, the 10 million staggering number, could be higher. Because if a significant number of those folks fall within the poor category, and as the gentlewoman from Texas well pointed out, it covers all people throughout the society, people who are working, people who are laid off for a while, but the ones at the lower rung of the ladder would not go out and report, there may be no way to find out, and that number may continue to increase in a country where this should not be happening.

Before I yield, I just would like maybe to take this time to ask something that may sound a little dramatic, but there are millions of American families who tonight will come home and there will either be a spouse there or there will be two spouses coming home from work, and throughout the night there is the "Turn off the TV set." "Did you do your homework?" "Let me help you with your homework." "Turn off the Nintendo set."

Maybe I am repeating my last night's statements, but my colleagues know this whole thing that we go through with discipline and love and affection, and yet many of those families know that they do not have this problem. Perhaps as they are putting their children to bed tonight, perhaps as they are turning in for the night, they realize that as bad as they have it in terms of tensions, living in this society, they still have something other families do not have.

But maybe that is a sign of gratefulness for what they have been provided with, we have been provided with, that they take a few minutes and write a letter to their Member of Congress and their Senator and say: "You know, I just put my child to bed, and I know if he is sick tomorrow I can take him to a clinic or to a doctor."

But there are 10 million children or more whose families cannot do that, and there are 40 million Americans who cannot do that, and we are not talking here about a rip-off, we are not talking here about a giveaway, we are not talking here about corporate welfare. We are talking here about basic human

needs, and maybe tonight Americans will take some time to write a letter to a Member of Congress and say: "If this is correct, and I believe it is, do something about it. This is not something I am upset about. I will not hold you negatively accountable for providing health care for 10 million children."

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I just wanted to say, if I could just follow up on one thing he said before, I am an advocate, as the gentleman has indicated he is as well, of universal health care. I believe very strongly that—and I did believe when the President 4 years ago came forward and said this is the issue, No. 1 issue that we must deal with, and we have to make sure that every American has health insurance. I believed that.

However, we know and the gentleman mentioned that, politics being the way it was in the last 4 years, we really realistically, politically realistically, cannot envision this Congress moving toward a universal health care system. So we did last Congress at least address the issue of portability and preexisting conditions.

The reason I believe that children's health and covering children is the next step in this sort of piecemeal approach that we have to follow because of political realities, is because not only of compassion which we all share for children but also because it is doable. If we look at the actual costs, it is cheaper to insure children than it is for the adults or their parents. And from a prevention point of view it makes the most sense because if we—we are all advocates of preventive care, but preventative care is so important for children, because if they do have proper health care in the early years, that prevents a lot of things happening later that are more costly and cause more damage to them later in life.

So it is a logical extension. Even if one does not believe that everyone should be covered or it is the government's responsibility to do that, at least understand that this is the next logical step. I think maybe that is what we can get across to our Republican colleagues. It has not worked so far, but maybe that is how we can emphasize it as the next step.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I just briefly want to commend the gentleman and my other colleagues here for raising this issue, for highlighting this important issue of children's health care. It is a very important issue. We hear it every time we go back to our districts.

In my district in Massachusetts there is not, literally not a day that goes by when I am there, when I am not approached by a parent who is concerned about the fact that they do not have health care for their children. They express also their frustration that, given that reality, why is not Congress doing something about it? And I have to say that I want to express my frustration,

too, over the Republican leadership's failure to make health care for children a priority. It should be a priority, and we certainly have enough time on our hands.

I am a freshman. I was sworn in on January 7, and we really have not accomplished a great deal in these first 50 days. We have the time. We spent an entire day on term limits, 12 votes on term limits. Term limits may be an important issue to some, but I got to tell my colleagues it is not as important as children's health care, and we need to do what we can to raise the pressure, to try to get the Republican leadership to follow the President's lead in making health care for children a priority.

The gentleman mentioned prevention. From a fiscally conservative, dollars and cents point of view, prevention is very, very important. We save money. If we invest in health care for our children now, it means we are going to have healthy adults, means we are going to be able to control health care costs in a more reasonable and effective fashion.

So just from a purely dollars and cents point of view, forget the moral arguments and whether it is the right thing to do, and we all know that it is the right thing to do, we save money. We should be ashamed of ourselves, with the greatest country in the world, the richest country in the world, and yet 10 million of our children that we know of—and my colleague from New York is right, it is probably much more than that, but we know at least 10 million children in this country do not have health care coverage and we need to do something about it.

So I just wanted to come on the floor here and express my gratitude to all of my colleagues for raising this issue. It is an important issue, and I hope that we will be able to do something about it in this session.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution and appreciate him participating in this special order, because I know that in his State in particular many efforts have been made to try to expand health care coverage. But, as we noticed in this New York survey, even with the States going out of their way in many cases to expand coverage it still—we still see an actual decline in the number of insured.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I am glad as well that the gentleman from Massachusetts has joined us, and I would like to maybe expand, Mr. SERRANO, the gentleman from New York's, call. I think I would not put it as a pitch but a call to families who, although they face their daily responsibilities, can count their blessings.

I would like to acknowledge and possibly add to that the many children's hospitals around the Nation. First, I would like to thank them. I think 2 to

1, the children's hospitals in our community, certainly the Texas Children's Hospital, I know that we can name so many others, keep their doors open as best they can.

I know that we have had circumstances where we have that great tragedy of drive-by emergency rooms, where they just cannot, because of capacity, take in more children. Why is that? Because an epidemic of measles has broken out, because an epidemic of small—not smallpox but chicken pox has broken out. Thank goodness we have overcome that. But just think of the times we have had these sort of epidemics, and therefore the hospital or facility is filled beyond capacity.

Part of the reason that this has come about is the very statement the gentleman just made. We have not had the kind of preventive health care, and I would like to add to his story that he has just given, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

And so I would like to add, to those who would be calling upon the need for health insurance to cover all of these children located across the Nation, our medical professionals, our pediatricians, our facilities that deal with children. They most of all know the seriousness of the need for having children have preventive care, and I would like to just bring a point to my colleagues' attention:

Studies have shown that the majority of uninsured children with asthma never see a doctor. How many of us are aware of asthma but do not realize that it can be deadly, and that the survival of a child and the child growing into adulthood is the fact that they have good constant care? And many of these asthmatic children are later hospitalized with problems that could have been averted with earlier intervention.

I have seen parents of children with asthma. Asthma has been in my family, though I have been very lucky that my children did not come down with it, but I have seen what asthma can do. We do not think of it sometimes as a debilitating disease. It is a chronic disease. To think of children with asthma not being able to see a doctor.

Maybe we are more sensitive to a broken leg or an injured arm, but realize children who suffer every day with these sort of ailments, children who need—as I said earlier, I do not want to deemphasize the importance of children who need counseling, and of course that is another subissue of this whole question of being insured. But many of those that would be covered would be psychologists or psychiatrists. Those children, too, could be healed with the kind of insurance that we would have and be allowed to secure a better quality of life.

I would simply say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], I hope people understand that what we are talking about is the quality of life for our children that many of us have been able to garner through hard work, of course. But these innocent children,

who come into this world certainly not of their own accord, but we are blessed that they are here, they are uninsured and not able to take care of the illnesses that face them every single day.

I think it is important, again, that this House gets down to the people's business and works on behalf of our children by passing this legislation both sponsored and supported by the President, many of our colleagues. Certainly leader GEPHARDT and minority leader DASCHLE were calling for this to move quickly. I hope that we can hear a date for this to be on the House floor posthaste.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate that.

Mr. SERRANO. Just as my colleague was speaking, I was reminded of the fact that just this week the New York State Health Department came into my congressional district or a certain part to do a special study on why that part of New York City has a higher rate of asthma attacks than anywhere else in the city.

And, as the gentlewoman said, this is in many cases a silent situation because people take it as something: "Well, I have heard about it. It does not affect me. It is not a broken leg," as she said. "It is not something I can see every day. I do not see it in the subway." We see somebody short of breath or something in the subway in New York, and we assume it is whatever, they were running down the stairs to catch the train because they were going to miss it.

So this itself starts me thinking how much of an implication this has on this whole study that will be conducted now in my district. It would just seem to me that the last call that we can make here is to say we have been hearing a lot of statements about family values, I repeat once again.

This is a family values issue, but it is an issue of how much we value families. And if we value families, then we must value the health care provided for the children. We cannot on one hand expect families to behave in a certain very nice, humanitarian American way, humane American way, and then at the same time have 10 million-plus children, families who are going through that situation, who face that on a daily basis, cannot react to everything else in society the way we expect them to.

And so I would hope that we see this in fact as a family values issue, an issue of how much we value families, and solve it. We can. We have the ability. All we need is the word from the other side and it can happen, it can happen soon.

Mr. PALLONE. I think the gentleman is absolutely right, and that is why this is a important part of the Democrats' "families first" agenda.

What my colleague pointed out, though, if I could follow up—and we have I guess about 15 minutes left, and we do not have to use the whole time for our one hour—but if we could just focus a little bit on solutions, because

there are solutions, and as we mentioned before, in many ways this is an easy problem to solve. It just takes the will, in this case, of the Republican majority to bring this bill or something like it to the floor.

There are really a lot of ways of looking at this, but in the case of the New York public advocates' report, they actually advocate two things which I think I favor, and maybe I could mention one other thing that they did not mention.

One is, they suggest essentially expanding the Medicaid program to cover people at higher levels; in other words, Medicaid now may take in people at 100 or even 200 percent of poverty, but not above that. Also, New York State, from what I understand, and maybe my colleague from New York would be more familiar with it, has a State-developed child health plus insurance program that essentially goes beyond Medicaid. The State subsidizes it, but it takes in people who would not normally be eligible for Medicaid. And most approaches to expanding health care coverage for children that I have seen either approach it by expanding Medicaid or looking at some other government subsidized, usually nonprofits program that would cover people that are not on Medicaid.

□ 1400

The third arm of this, though, that is not mentioned by the public advocate, at least to my knowledge, but I think is just as important, is outreach, because what the public advocate in New York City actually identifies is that there are a number of people that are eligible for the Medicaid Program or eligible for the child health plus program that are not using it.

So I think whatever we develop has to have an outreach program, because there are a lot of people who are not taking advantage of existing programs, for whatever reason, either because they are not aware of it, or if you talk about children, if their parents are not aware of it, they cannot take advantage of it.

I do not know if she wants to talk a little bit about this, but I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I think the outreach is key. That was certainly part of the administration's proposal, to find individuals who could comply or meet the criteria of Medicaid who have not been aware of it, and would certainly be able to secure that coverage.

I would like to add another piece for thought. Certainly I know we will hear from many of our local governments that they are overburdened, but many of our cities have city clinics, and one of the aspects of their service is what I described as well care. That is preventative care.

I think if we can find some aspect of our legislation that would cover that aspect of treatment, where parents of certain eligibility could continue to

take their children, say, to age 10 or 12 for well care, that is, all the preventative measures, to ensure that they have all of the immunizations.

We have treated immunizations in this country as crises. That means we will have big campaigns, we will go out with vans. We have not gotten the mind-set of parents and the availability where, on a regular ritual, those parents who do not have regular physicians or pediatricians still are getting their children immunized; certainly our school districts, our work, but our health clinics certainly should be a component of the well care. We are not asking them to treat the emergencies, chronic illnesses, but if they are a component of delivery of health.

And I can hear a lot of them right now say in horror, we do not have the money. But I think as we look as a national body about how we reach out, I would assume my colleague, the gentleman from New York, has several city health clinics and he might hear the same thing, they are overloaded, but they are still accessible to our communities, along with—let me add that I think I would like us to consider school-based clinics where children go most of all.

I would like to say, we may cause a great deal of furor here on the floor of the House, but I would like to literally ask Americans to send us their stories. Tell us what is going on out there. We all know what is going on in the 18th District in Texas, in New Jersey and in New York.

But I would like to hear the stories of Americans, the parents and guardians of these 10 million children, the grandparents, who equally are custodians of these children, who for several reasons would not have access to health insurance for these children. We want to hear your stories.

Maybe that, along with stories from pediatricians and others, would be able to help build the argument, if you will, for the immediate response to try to come up with legislation that will cover these children.

I hope that the question of reaching out will be addressed, as I said, by embellishing local city health clinics, giving them the resources they can treat in preventative care up to age 10 or 12, that we can look at school-based clinics. That is where parents and children go.

Certainly I would like to ensure that we reach out to those who are eligible for Medicaid and cannot get it. Thank goodness we did not block grant, something we fought so very hard against. A lot of people do not even understand when we say block grant, but that is a fight we may have to see again; where there is a need, we may be able and should be able to serve Americans. And that was not the thrust of block granting; that was to cut off moneys. We fought hard, the Democrats did, against that. Now we have another cause that can be bipartisan from the very start, to be able to work with 10 million uninsured children.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentlewoman brought up the community-based health clinics. I have some in my district, as well. The problem, of course, they face is scarce resources. In other words, increasingly the amount of money that has been made available to them has dwindled. That is another reason why we see the ranks of not only the uninsured but even people who have access to health care, because they are really dealing with the uninsured in many cases, but the access becomes more limited as resources become scarce.

I yield to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas makes an interesting point. That is, we should deal with the issue of prevention. You know, we Americans are really a very strange group of people at times. Who would not think of taking their car for an oil change or doing it themselves? There are some Americans who run the car into the ground, but most Americans know they have to do this. They either do it themselves in their driveway or somewhere, or they take it to a place to have it done. That is understood.

But the whole idea of taking a human being at the age of under 10 to a clinic to get some preventative health care, some wellness care, is beyond our scope of thinking. Yet, at the end of the game when we talk about dollars and cents, as the gentleman has so well pointed out, and the gentlewoman, we are saving lots of money by going in the area of prevention. So I would hope that in this package, and I agree, there has to be something that perhaps begins to tell us about the area of prevention.

As far as solutions, what is really sad about this whole argument is that the solution we already have. The bad news is that 40 million Americans are not covered. The good news is that if you do quick math, over 200 million Americans are covered. Therefore, under existing plans, through expansion and with the desire to do so, you can invent ways and bring about ways of covering the other 40 million. So we do not have to reinvent the wheel. What we have to do is simply look at what we have now and use it as the existing solution to move on to cover other people in the area where we should not allow disparity between different folks.

Because in other parts of the society we have these problems and we have to deal with them on a daily basis. The fact is that most likely the people that are on that chart will also be the people who will have less access to a computer in the home than other people in this society. We know that. But this one is a basic right at this moment that people all deserve and we should be dealing with.

So the solution, in answer to your question, which is an interesting point you bring up, because we certainly do

not want to end this hour having people say sure, they brought up the problem, they did not offer a solution, the solution is 200 million Americans, 99 percent of whom are not wealthy people, are covered under existing plans. It is now a matter of finding out how do we cover the other 40 million, how do we take care of people who may be unemployed, and how do we especially take care of children.

I would end today, again, by calling on Americans who may have health insurance, who may have a difficult, at times, life, but most of the time can as our colleagues said, count their blessings, to reach out to their Members of Congress and say that this is not something that can go on. Let us do something about it. Let us expand existing programs. Let us find solutions to this problem.

Once again, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing forth this issue today. This is one that I think really begins to speak to what this Congress should be about. If this Congress and this society cannot take care of its children, then it will not take care of anything else in this society.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree, and I want to thank the gentleman. I know we are winding down.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Before we close, let me thank the gentleman as well for gathering us together on this special order, and hopefully our voices were heard in this Chamber as my good friend, the gentleman from New York, has said, on behalf of the children and the solutions that we have offered. We can get busy right now and get moving on an ounce of prevention that will certainly create the wall against the pound of cure that we may face with children who have not had health care for all of their childhood.

I thank the gentleman very much and look forward to working with him.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both of the Members, and again issue our challenge to our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle.

Once again, I think we had one vote today on the Journal, on the Journal of the previous day, and no other legislative business, and it is only Thursday. I personally, and I know all of us, are getting frustrated coming down here day after day and not really doing anything.

This is an issue, children's health care, that needs to be addressed immediately. We will continue to call upon our colleagues in the Republican leadership on the other side to address this issue this Congress, and as soon as possible.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concern for the 10 million children in our Nation who are without health care insurance. I am here to urge each and every one of my colleagues to work toward guaranteed access to health care for all children. It is time for us to make America's children and their health and well-being our highest priority. We must make health care

available, accessible, and affordable for all of our children.

I am concerned that many of my colleagues have dismissed these children as the offspring of the same disadvantaged persons that they condemned last year during the welfare debate. If that was an accurate characterization of America's uninsured children, I would beg you not to blame a child, for their parents' misfortune.

But it is not an accurate picture, and so instead, I say you are wrong. Nine out of ten children who are without health coverage have parents who work. Nearly two in three of these children have parents who are employed full-time during the entire year. Two-thirds of these children live in families with income above the poverty line and more than three in five live in two-parent families.

It is clear that these children are not uninsured because their parents are not unemployed. Instead, most of these children are without coverage because their parents work for companies who have cut health coverage for children or who offer no health coverage at all. Each year since 1989, 900,000 fewer children have received private health insurance coverage. In other words, every 35 seconds 1 less child is privately insured.

Without private insurance, millions of working parents who labor to support their families cannot afford to provide health coverage for their children. The cost of health insurance when not purchased through an employer is often prohibitive. So while Medicaid helps our poorest children, and more affluent families can afford private coverage, millions of working parents in the middle cannot provide coverage for their children.

Insurance coverage is critical to the health of our children. Children without health insurance coverage often do not receive necessary treatment services or even the most basic care. Medical expenses are sufficiently high that generally their financially burdened parents will delay or forgo needed pediatric preventive or medical care.

Some examples—studies have shown that the majority of uninsured children with asthma never see a doctor. Many of these asthmatic children are later hospitalized with problems that could have been averted with earlier intervention. One-third of uninsured children with recurrent ear infections do not see the doctor and some later develop permanent hearing loss. Many children with undiagnosed vision problems cannot even read a blackboard. Finally, studies show that children without insurance do not receive adequate immunization, have higher rates of visits for illness care, and have more frequent emergency room visits.

It is obvious that to deny children health care coverage, denies them the opportunity to lead healthy lives and to reach their fullest potential. We, in this Congress, have a responsibility to ensure that all children have these opportunities. We must commit ourselves to coverage for every American child and promise to leave no child behind.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was on the floor talking about the

importance of a balanced budget amendment. Much to my chagrin, there was an announcement yesterday that probably certainly weakened the effort for a balanced budget amendment in the Senate.

In 1969, if you read the newspaper, you probably would have read about Charles Manson. The number one song was Simon and Garfunkle's "Mrs. Robinson." The Mets won the World Series. I was an 8-year-old boy growing up in western South Dakota and had the opportunity to watch on a black and white television, Neal Armstrong take one giant step forward for mankind by walking on the Moon.

Little did I know at that time that that was the start of our taking one giant step backward fiscally, because 1969 was the last time that Congress and our country has been able to balance its budget.

It occurs to me, it has been my long-held belief that every generation of Americans has an appointment with destiny. For my grandfather who came to this country from Norway back in 1906, it was to help build America. He worked on and helped build the railroad that went across our State of South Dakota. Later he went on to be in the hardware business.

For my father, his appointment with destiny was to defend America. As a decorated World War II fighter pilot, when the call came for him to defend America in World War II, he was there.

I believe that for this generation of Americans, it is our responsibility to preserve America for the next generation. I think we are failing in our duty and the obligation we have to make this a better place for the next generation of Americans.

When it comes time to vote on a balanced budget amendment, the issue really is about our future and what will we do for our children. A lot has been made, there are a lot of distractions and diversions in this whole debate about reasons why we do not need a balanced budget amendment. But the fact remains that 1969 is the last time that Congress has had the political will to submit a balanced budget and to do what is right for the future of this country.

If we look at where we are today and the burden we are passing on, the legacy we are handing on to the next generation of Americans, in my view it is immoral, it is wrong. We have an opportunity this next week to vote to do something that will be meaningful. It is the most important vote I think that we will cast for the future of our country.

I am hopeful that we will see, when the Senate votes on this next Tuesday, that there will be some of the people, some of the Democrats who are currently opposed to it, perhaps one of the two from my State of South Dakota, who will come forward and recognize the importance of this important move to the future of this country.

We cannot afford to continue to mortgage the future for our kids and

for our grandkids. So as we continue to engage the debate in this town and around this country, and as I traveled in my State of South Dakota for 9 days last week, I had the opportunity to raise this issue and to talk about it and its importance.

One of the questions that was repeatedly asked was what about Social Security, because they had heard a lot of radio ads that had been running in my State by opponents of a balanced budget amendment attacking me for my vote on it.

The point I come back to is if we do not do something to balance this country's budget, and if we do not impose the discipline necessary to do it, not only is Social Security jeopardized, but so is every other Government program. The only way we can protect Social Security for the long-term and make it a program that is there not only for today's seniors but for tomorrow's seniors is to pass a balanced budget amendment.

So, as I heard and listened to the discussion that was held last week in my State of South Dakota about this issue, I kept coming back to the same point. That is that as a young 8-year-old in western South Dakota in 1969, I had no idea of what was about to begin. But for the past 28 years, we have accumulated and amassed in this country \$5.3 trillion in debt, or \$20,000 for every man, woman, and child in America.

I am calling on, today, hoping that our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, when this vote comes up next week, will look into their hearts and see if this is not the right move. It is not only the right move, it is the only move if we are to preserve a future for our kids and for our grandkids.

I hope we will have the opportunity in this House, if the Senate goes first and votes and will approve a balanced budget amendment, that we can do it in the House and make this a better place for the next generation.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). The Chair reminds Members to refrain from references to Members of the other body urging action by the other body.

#### EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today I continue my series on talking about what works and what does not work in education and why it is such a needed focus. But before I do that, I just have a few miscellaneous comments on some issues that have been in the news over the last couple of days that I would like my colleagues to be aware of.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced a constitutional amendment. I introduced a constitutional amendment which would allow for a procedure where voters could recall their elected officials. So far in this Congress, I have not reintroduced that bill. But yesterday I decided that it was again time to perhaps make a few modifications to facilitate that process. But it is time to reintroduce the bill that allows public citizens, it allows the citizens of this country to hold their elected officials accountable for the promises and the commitments that they make during an election.

Over the last few days, we have seen where individuals who campaigned and were elected during the campaign process made a series of promises and commitments to the voters that said, if I am elected, this is what I will stand for. This is what I will do. And these are the kinds of actions that you can expect me to take as your elected Representative.

It appears that too often that is all they are, is campaign promises. They are a great way to get a vote, but when they get to Washington, they all of a sudden decide that maybe it is a lousy way to govern. Well, it is about time that voters started to recognize and have the opportunity to tie candidates to their performance, that when they run a campaign, they see a direct link between what an individual promises in a campaign and what they do once they get here. And that when they fail to see that link between a campaign and a performance, rather than just having to stand back and say, there is nothing that I can do about this, there is nothing that I can do about somebody that I voted for, somebody that I supported because they said they were going to do these things and then they go to Washington and they do something else. They now will be empowered with a tool that says, you said you were going to do that and you got to Washington and you decided that something else was going to happen and that your behavior was going to move in a different direction.

Well, as a voter in your State, I now have the opportunity to say I voted for you because this is what you were going to do and, now that you have decided to do something else, I would like the opportunity to clarify and to hold you accountable for breaking the promises and breaking your commitment to me. It is time that the American people or at least the States in this country, it is time that the States had the opportunity to design a mechanism which will more effectively and more immediately allow the citizens to hold their elected officials accountable.

It is unconscionable that we keep finding individuals on key issues who say one thing and do another. We are going to have a voter empowerment. In the States it is commonly known as the ability to hold elected officials accountable through a recall mechanism. We will have a recall bill. I urge my

colleagues to take a look at it, to take a look at what is fueling voter cynicism and to say, yes, let us give the voters one more tool to hold their Representatives accountable.

On another topic that again fuels cynicism in Washington, last year we had a very critical debate on partial birth abortions. It would be nice to believe that what we debate here on the floor and the information that we receive is accurate. However, we now find that an abortion rights doctor admitted to lying about the frequency of partial birth abortions. He said, I lied through my teeth. It is a form of killing. You are ending a life. Went on to say that this was used not only in rare cases, it was used more frequently, that it was not only used on situations where the fetus was in distress but was used on healthy women with healthy children. Based on that kind of testimony, President Clinton vetoed our legislation to prohibit this gruesome act. So I am hopeful and anxious that we will revisit that issue based on this new information.

I also could not help but just find the irony that we as a society, as we focus on the right to kill unborn children, the headlines this week were, we are trying to find ways to clone sheep at the same time and on the same page, according to the headline, morning-after pill receives FDA approval. The FDA has also moved forward aggressively. Abortion bill accord clears way for sales, RU-486.

So as we are cloning sheep, we keep trying to come up with more innovative ways to take the lives of the most defenseless in our society, the unborn. We have gone so far that environmentalist groups in this Nation score votes against abortion. They score votes in favor of protecting the unborn as a vote against the environment because they identify the greatest danger to birds and their habitat is more people. So a vote for the unborn is now a vote against the environment. It is interesting to see how these debates and these issues are being structured in our society today.

But let us move on to education. Education is a critical issue in this Nation today. We have gone through a series of what we call lessons learned, what are we learning about education. We are going through a process which we call education at a crossroads. I do not think there is much doubt that there is a widespread belief that we have to take a look at what is going on in education in our country.

We have lots of statistics about what the results are in our Nation. One half of all adult Americans are functionally illiterate. This includes not being able to write a letter to explain a billing error or figure out a departure on a bus schedule. Sixty-four percent of 12th graders do not read at a proficient level.

In California, 2½ weeks ago, we had a hearing where the college presidents came in. They said, make sure that as

you go forward and take a look at education funding, that you continue to fund remedial education. We need Federal remedial education dollars to be successful.

You sit back and say, now, what do you mean by remedial? Remedial education. Somebody that has been accepted into your institution of higher learning, what are you teaching these kids, what do they need remedial education in? Are you trying to teach them more complex writing skills, more complex math skills, what are you teaching them? They said, no, when these kids are graduating from high school and, of course, many go on to college, they cannot read or write at an eighth grade level. Excuse me. They cannot read or write at an eighth grade level?

They get into college and they want more remedial education dollars. As a college president, have you ever thought about going back to your high schools and trying to find out what is going on in the high schools that maybe we could teach them reading and writing and math and when they go through high school rather than trying to deal with it when they get to college.

In Washington, DC, we have decided that it is necessary to take the elected school board and replace them by an appointed administrator. Why? Because these kids are getting the lowest test scores in the country. We are failing the kids right outside of this building. It is not an issue of money, \$8,300 per student, and they get the lowest test scores and some of the lowest test scores in the country.

In my own State of Michigan our Governor has proposed taking over a number of school districts because we are failing the kids. I asked the Governor, I said, what makes you think that as a Governor, removed from the local situation, you can do a better job of educating these kids than what the local school board can do? And the disappointing fact is, and he is probably right, he said, I cannot do any worse. When you have got 2 or 3 kids out of 250 kids who are passing a proficiency test, increasing that to 4 or 5 is a significant improvement but it is way below what is acceptable in this Nation.

We know that, as we take a look at education, as we have gone around the country, as we have been in east Harlem, New York, as we have been in Chicago and we have been in Los Angeles and Phoenix and Napa and towns in my own district, we know that, No. 1, the most successful schools and the most successful kids in our country, the ones that are learning are, where parents are involved and, No. 2, in very difficult areas, where school administrators and principals have developed a dynamic program and they have reached out into their community and they have involved their parents, the parents of the kids, then we have the most likely scenario for success. And we are going around the country and

we are taking a look at what works and what is wasted.

Why do we have to take a look at what is working and what is wasted? We know there is a problem. Some people would say, well, why are you reviewing this at all; the Federal Government should not be involved in education. That may or may not be a correct argument. That is not the argument that we have in front of us today. The argument that we have in front of us today is that this town, Washington, DC, with this Department, the Department of Education, and 39 other agencies, has a tremendous impact on education at all levels in our Nation. This town, these bureaucrats, run 39 different agencies. This town—and these bureaucrats who are very good people, they are knowledgeable people, but they are asked to administer through 39 different agencies, we ask these people to administer 760 programs.

Remember what these people do and they are matched by their counterparts at the State level and at the local level. It is all good people with good intentions trying to do the right thing, and what they are doing is they have all got a stack of paper. They are all processing paper, which means that dollars go to processing paper and employing people. It keeps the dollars away from the classroom because remember, every time we create one of these 760 programs, we have to let people know that these programs exist. So we have got a bureaucrat who designs the brochure that says, here is the program and here is who might qualify.

At the other end of the communications pattern, we have got another bureaucrat that gets the brochure. They read the brochure and say, we might qualify for this program. Let us get some more information. Maybe let us even get an application. Let us fill out the application. It goes into the pile of paper. They fill out the application. They send it back to a bureaucrat in Washington who reads it and says, well, I have got a whole stack of applications. I am going to have to sort through who gets what and how much. Eventually they will decide. They send the money back.

□ 1430

The person says, "Well, I am getting the money. Now what stack of paper says what can I do with it?" Of course, they have to fill out papers sending back to Washington saying, "Here is what we did with it." That gets back to Washington and somebody has to read it to determine whether they actually spent it the way it was intended to be spent.

So we are employing lots of bureaucrats in 39 different agencies, administering 760 programs, spending \$120 billion a year; \$120 billion per year in 760 programs going through 39 different agencies. Probably a little bit of concern as to whether we are actually getting our dollar's worth.

And that is why we are taking a look at what is going on in Washington.

What works and what is wasted? Spending time at the grassroots level and saying, we have 760 programs, we have 14 literacy programs, why can our kids not read when they are graduating from high school?

And what we are saying is, before we put on another overlay of more programs and more spending and more dollars, it is time to take a look at this conglomeration of programs, and look at it from a teacher's level and look at it from a kid's level and say, are these dollars getting to our children? Are these dollars getting into the classroom, or are the dollars being spent shuffling paper back and forth?

The Heritage Foundation has told us in their study that just in the Federal bureaucracy we lose 15 percent. And when we add in State and local bureaucracies, my estimate is that we lose about 35 to 40 cents of every education dollar to bureaucracy and bureaucrats who are doing what we ask them to do, but they are prohibiting the dollars from getting to our children and getting into the classroom.

And even then, as we have found out as we have made these field visits, the dollars get into the classroom and you ask somebody, do you appreciate the Federal programs? Yes, we appreciate getting the money, but when we get the rules and regulations of how we need to spend it, and then we take a look at our kids and we take a look at our school and we take a look at our classrooms and we take a look at our teachers and we take a look at our community and what we would really like to do in our classrooms for our kids, and then we take a look at what the rules and the guidelines from some bureaucracy in Washington are, that has never been in our town, that does not know the names of our kids, and what they tell us to do is not what we really want to do, it is not our No. 1 priority. It might be somewhere on our priority list, but it does not help us do what we think we need to do to help our kids today.

The lesson today is more does not always equal better. If we have a program, if we have 760 programs and we are spending \$120 billion, there are those that are saying, and we are not getting results, we ought to be spending more. And if we had a couple more programs and a few more dollars, we would be able to solve the problem.

This was in the paper this week: "Drug Education Shows Limited Success, Department Reports." Many children still turn to drugs between the 5th and 8th grades despite billions of Federal dollars that have been spent on drug education since 1987.

The Education Department reported that. A report commissioned by the Department said effects were small even in the programs that appeared to curb drug use.

Now, this is the interesting thing. One would think that after the Education Department completes its own study that says kids are still turning

to drugs, which is a terrible problem, the effects were small, one would think that they would step back and say, why are we not getting the results? This is a terrible problem. We all want to curb drug use. We have spent billions of dollars. We are not having an impact.

One would think the Education Department would step back and say, let us rethink this. Let us come together and say this is not working, and let us think about bringing in parents, bringing in legislators, bringing in State people, bringing in teachers and saying, let us take another look at this problem; how are we going to solve this? We need to approach it in a different way.

So what is the Department's solution? The Department wants \$620 million next year for drug education. They do not want us to rethink or come up with new programs or different programs to replace what they admit are the failed policies and a billion dollars of wasted money. They want \$620 million next year for drug education, up from \$558 million this year and \$438 million in 1996.

This is the lesson we should be learning: More does not always equal better. More dollars going to Washington bureaucracies—dollars to bureaucracies, dollars to bureaucracies—does not necessarily mean we are going to be solving the problem.

It is amazing to me that as we prepared this lesson this week, I cut this out of the paper this week. It is a classic case of bureaucrats not worrying about whether we are solving the problem but saying we solve the problem purely by making more dollars available; not making them available in an attempt to build off an analysis that says these programs failed, and here is why they failed and here is a new approach.

They just say, here are the failed programs. Let us not rethink it. But if you just give me \$62 million more into this same failed system, we will have protected a lot of bureaucrats and a lot of paperwork. We will not have helped any more kids, but we will be able to go back and say we gave \$62 million more for drug education. Probably will not spend a lot of time talking about it does not really matter they will not work, but, hey, they are spending more.

So they can say we are spending more than a 10-percent increase in funding, more than a 10-percent increase in funding in failed programs. But the disappointing thing here is there is no thinking about what we need to do for our kids. It means pouring more money, hard-earned money into a broken system, a tragic system. And in too many places it is the argument that we hear over and over again.

And let me say this. We may raise an issue during the appropriations process about why are we going to increase spending by \$62 million on drug education programs that, by the way, do not work, and it will be said, there

they go again, those mean-spirited people cutting dollars for our kids. No, the Education Department said it. The drug education programs are not working. It is about time that that issue was raised.

It is the same question that we are trying to answer in Education at a Crossroads; that when the President proposes spending \$50 billion more on education, before we go out and spend \$50 billion more into what in some cases is a failed system, we should step back and say, 760 programs, 39 agencies, \$120 billion per year: Is there maybe not a better way to do it?

Is there not maybe an issue that we should be raising, before we try to mobilize 100,000 tutors, that we take a look and say why do our 14 literacy programs not work today? And if tutors are better than our current literacy programs, if tutors are the right answer, let us go for tutors. Maybe we can pay for the tutors by saying the literacy programs we had in place were not working and so we will be able to fund not 100,000 tutors but 200,000 tutors because we are going to get rid of the failed literacy programs.

Let us step back and see what is working and what does not work before we just put a patchwork of more programs on a failed system. The issue here is not money. There is plenty of money in the system. The issue is making sure that we spend the dollars on the right kinds of things.

We have gone to schools in, like I said, in New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, L.A., Napa, Phoenix. We are going to Cincinnati, we are going to Delaware next week, we are going to have hearings on the D.C. schools, schools in Detroit. We have gone and we are going all around the country, and we have seen schools that spend \$2,200 per child, we have seen schools that spend \$8,300 per child.

What does the research of our committee show? Our committee's research shows that more does not always equal better. Pouring more dollars into a bad system does not fix the system.

If we put in place the right system, we can educate the kids. It is the fun thing about this project. The great thing about this project is going into some of what we in Washington define as some of the greatest areas of at-risk kids, kids who supposedly are at a disadvantage for learning, and seeing schools and seeing children that are getting a great education. It is because parents are involved, the schools are focusing on the basics, and the dollars go into the classroom and not into a bureaucracy.

The issue is not how much money is spent but it is how we spend it. Are we spending it on kids? Are we spending it on the basics? Are we spending it on teachers? Are we spending it at places closest to the kids, or are we pouring it into bureaucracies and bureaucrats who are greatly removed from the system?

The dollars: The District of Columbia, as I mentioned, spends over \$8,000



per child yet their children are not graduating, they are not reading and they are not succeeding. Schools in New York: Some of the schools that I visited, \$2,200 to \$2,500 per child, and they are very, very successful. More spending does not always equal better.

We need to focus on how we spend it, not how much money is being spent. That is what Education at a Crossroads is doing: Visiting communities, talking to people, finding out what is working, finding out how effective the Federal programs are, and then going back and identifying what we need to do in Washington to straighten out our bureaucratic mess so that we can help our kids.

The focus of this whole issue cannot be the Department of Education or the other 38 agencies that are trying to educate kids. It cannot be a bureaucratic focus. It cannot be on this town. The focus has to be on kids around the country.

□ 1445

The problem that we have in Washington today and the problem that we maybe have in our country today is if we go back and take a look at this graphic: Where education in this country is supposed to be, parental involvement and local control, independent of Washington interference, so that programs in classrooms, in instructional materials, in instructional lessons can be tailored to the needs of every individual child in every individual community.

What we have found is that rather than local control, these 39 agencies in Washington that are trying to educate our kids have made the street that some of you may walk down to get to work every day, which we fondly call Independence Avenue, when you take a look at who is lining the sides of that street, it is all the bureaucracies here in Washington, and the end result is one of these days we may have to rename it, not Independence Avenue but Dependence Avenue because all of these agencies are fostering local dependence on Washington bureaucracies before they can do anything. That is why parents are frustrated.

This is ironic. Why are parents frustrated? Kids cannot do math so we are going to have 100,000 new tutors. They are going to be administered by an agency that cannot even keep its own books. All parents are frustrated because they want to give their children a chance to receive a quality education and we stand in the way.

We are investing a tremendous amount of money in education. But too often it seems like that money is wasted. It is not getting to our kids and it is going to inefficient systems, so it is wasted. Think of how much money is spent on administrators and education bureaucrats. Think of how little money actually reaches the kids. Like I told you earlier, 60 cents of every dollar gets to our children.

I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I do not want to take up too much of the gentleman's time, but I will just briefly say, he talked about Dependence Avenue and the bureaucracy, the Federal bureaucracy on Dependence Avenue, the Department of Education bureaucracy.

I think one of the finest examples of how Americans' dollars, tax dollars, come up to Washington, DC to these huge Federal bureaucracies and do not get back home is the example of the Department of Education who 2 years ago said that they had to cut their budget by \$100 billion to keep schools across the country safe from caving in and collapsing. But in that same budget where they cut \$100 million from the safe schools part of the program, they added \$20 million just to improve their single bureaucracy building on Independence Avenue.

So here we have an example not of robbing Peter to pay Paul, but an example of the Federal bureaucratic machine robbing our children to feed bureaucracy instead of doing what needs to be done in education. I applaud the gentleman for actually having the courage to stand up and say enough is enough to this nonsense, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague from Florida for those comments. That is why parents are frustrated. They want to give their kids a quality education, and at the end of the day they see us taking care of bureaucrats and bureaucrats not taking care of their kids, taking care of Washington but not taking care of Holland, MI. And it is kind of like, well, we never really wanted you to take care of Holland, MI, in the first place, but you took all of our money and you sent it to Washington and now to get it back we need to do what you want us to do and then think of the results.

What is happening? How much money is spent on education? Consider the results. Half of American children cannot read, cannot meet the minimum expectations for math and reading. We spend more money per child than nearly every other industrial country, yet our children simply are not learning the way we would like them to.

Think about this. Why are parents frustrated? Why are parents frustrated? They want to give their kids a quality education. Fewer than half of all dollars spent on public education are spent in the classroom. Fewer than half. Low test scores, frustrated parents, kids who are not learning, plenty of money, fewer than half the dollars are spent in the classroom. They are spent on bureaucrats, on support personnel, on administration buildings, but less than half are spent on children in the classroom.

Parents, local control, that is most important about getting our kids to learn. We must restore the crucial parental role in education. Parents have the right to choose the school that is best for their child. Parents have the right to choose the best school for

their child. Parents have the right, not bureaucrats assigning kids. Parents pay for it, it is their tax dollars, it is your tax dollars. Tax dollars should go to the schools of the taxpayers' choice.

Remember, at the end of the day, more does not always equal better. Only in Washington is that accepted, that more equals better. In the rest of America, it is fairly common knowledge that more does not always equal better. It is not how much money is spent, it is how we spend it. When we spend a dollar and only 50 cents goes into the classroom, the answer may not be spending \$1.20 to get 60 cents in the classroom. It may be taking a look at the dollar and saying 50 cents of overhead, that may just be too much. Maybe we can take that dollar and maybe we can find another dime for our kids if we take it out of the bureaucracy, maybe if we take it out of the paperwork shuffle between local school districts, State bureaucrats and Washington bureaucrats. Maybe if we take it out of that system, maybe if we simplify it and we make it 200 programs instead of 760 programs, maybe if we make it 2 agencies instead of 39 agencies, maybe we could just find that extra nickel or that extra dime for our kids. It is not how much is spent, it is how we spend it. Today we are spending way too much on the wrong kinds of things. We need to get the money into the classroom.

#### THE LONG-TERM CAPITAL GAINS SAVINGS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation, the Long-Term Capital Gains Savings Act, that takes an innovative and I believe economically correct approach to capital gains tax policy. This legislation seeks to reward long-term economically productive investment and encourage Americans to save for the future.

I might also add that I have been one who has voted consistently for a balanced budget and said we should put off tax cuts until we balance the budget. I still think that is a prudent policy, but as we see both the administration and the leadership of the Congress moving in the other direction, I think it is also prudent that we lay out markers of what would be good tax policy.

This legislation is identical to S. 306 introduced by Senator WENDELL FORD in the other body and would provide for the maximum capital gains tax rate to be adjusted downward the longer an investment is held by the taxpayer. For every year an asset is held, the tax rate would be reduced by 2 percentage points down to a rate of 14 percent after 8 years or more. The top rate would remain at 28 percent for investments held less than 2 years. I am attaching a chart outlining this sliding

scale and will include it for the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out that this legislation as drafted would apply only to individual taxpayers and not to corporate taxpayers. I believe this is good fiscal and tax policy because it limits the cost of this legislation and targets the tax relief to help middle-income families most in need of this assistance.

For many years we have heard many in business, agriculture, economics, and politics argue that a high capital gains tax rate locks in capital and discourages investment that might otherwise be put to work in more productive investments and thus spur greater economic activity.

While I have questioned whether capital has remained on the sidelines, I do believe that the low differential between marginal income tax rates and the 28 percent capital gains rate along with the effective tax of inflation does lock up capital and discourage some investment, particularly in long-term instruments that might otherwise occur. This legislation is aimed to address such inefficiencies in the current code while not providing a windfall for short-term speculation and adding to the deficit.

First, it will reward individual investors who make economically productive long-term investments rather than short-term speculative ones. I believe someone who holds an investment for a period of time should receive more favorable tax treatment on their gains than someone who turns over assets on a short-term basis. The investment in a fledgling company which takes many years to develop but could become the next Microsoft should receive a more favorable benefit than a gain earned over a 6-month period due to a runup in the capital or credit markets. Further, by racheting the rate downward the longer the holding period, we help offset the inflation penalty which results with a fixed rate. And we avoid the difficulty of indexing against the original basis. This legislation will reward investments in small businesses and agriculture, which require long-term commitment and are our Nation's primary engines of economic growth and job creation. It may also affect long-term interest rates in a positive manner. It will encourage Americans to make the investments necessary to start and expand such businesses.

Second, this legislation will provide incentives for Americans to save for the future and prepare for their retirement. There is widespread agreement among economists that our savings rate is too low, slowing our economy and putting at risk the comfortable retirement Americans desire. This legislation will happy address this need for increased savings and provide a more secure retirement for Americans in the future.

Most importantly, this legislation will achieve these benefits without putting the goal of a balanced budget out

of reach. Broader capital gains tax relief would be simply too costly, requiring offsetting revenue increases or budget cuts that are unrealistic and imprudent. If we try to do too much, we will put a realistic balanced budget out of reach, encouraging the use of gimmicks and rosy scenarios. This legislation represents the kind of capital gains tax relief we can afford in the context of balancing the budget.

This legislation takes a responsible, balanced approach that will encourage prudent investment and savings and reward those who invest for the long-term, while still allowing us to balance the Federal budget. I still believe that our first priority must be to balance the Federal budget. However, I am also of the belief that inclusion of a modest, commonsense capital gains tax relief legislation which is fully paid for can and should be part of the balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, the chart referred to in my remarks is as follows:

*Sliding Scale Capital Gains Proposal*

Assets held for the following period:	Percent <sup>1</sup>
More than 1 year .....	28
More than 2 years .....	26
More than 3 years .....	24
More than 4 years .....	22
More than 5 years .....	20
More than 6 years .....	18
More than 7 years .....	16
More than 8 years .....	14

<sup>1</sup> Would be subject to the lower of the current law capital gains rate or the rate listed.

**PASSING THE AMERICAN DREAM  
ON TO OUR CHILDREN**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I came up today to talk about passing the American dream on to our children.

We have heard so much today, and it appears that people have been getting together on the other side of the aisle for some time the past couple of weeks trying to figure out a strategy, where to take their party over the next 2 years. We heard a lot more talk about children. In fact, that is what we heard over the past 2 years, constant references to children, children, children. We have got to help children.

I can tell you as the father of a 9-year-old boy and a 6-year-old boy, I have got to say that our children's future has got to be our top priority. Like my parents, I want to ensure that my children and all children have an opportunity to achieve the American dream, an opportunity. In America we cannot guarantee the outcome, but we are at least responsible in ensuring that all American children have the opportunity to achieve the American dream.

There have been fights over the past two decades, three decades on how we ensure that all American children have

the opportunity to achieve the American dream, battles over affirmative action, battles over quotas, battles over other issues. But those have been fights of the past. Unfortunately, the fights that we are going to be waging in the future may be trying to figure out how to make sure that any American children can achieve the American dream.

Because, you see, a fiscal crisis, a financial cloud hovers over this country that is so tremendous, so great, so frightening that all of our children face an economic Armageddon in the next 20 years.

□ 1500

Right now we are \$5.6 trillion in debt, and it has gotten so out of hand that few Americans can even begin to fathom what \$5.6 trillion means to the next working generation. One way to put it is an illustration, and I heard it earlier today, and I have heard it before and used it before. To try to understand what a trillion dollars is, or \$5.6 trillion is, think about this:

If you made \$1 million every single day from the day that Jesus Christ was born 2,000 years ago until today, you would not make enough money to pay off our Federal debt, a million dollars every day for 2000 years.

But the news gets worse. If you made \$1 million every day from today until the year AD 4000, and added all that money up on top of the million dollars a day that you made over the past 1,000 years, you still would not have enough money over that 4,000-year timeframe making \$1 million every day to pay off our Federal debt.

And yet I hear people come up and get behind that microphone and actually have the audacity to tell us how much they love children, when at the same time these are the same people that are opposing our attempts at a balanced budget amendment or a balanced budget that would restore fiscal sanity to the United States of America.

I see some younger people here in the audience, and unfortunately I have some bad news for them. If you think it is going to be bad enough trying to pay off \$5.6 trillion, wait until the baby boomers start retiring in the year 2010. Then your chances are completely eviscerated unless the adults in this Chamber start behaving like adults very, very soon.

You see, the Senate had a bipartisan commission put together 3 years ago, headed by a Democrat, Senator KERREY. And you know what they figured out? They figured out that, unless we balance our budget and take control of financial spending in Washington, DC, that the average American—now get this—the average American is going to be paying 89 percent of their income to the Federal Government by the year 2020.

Now, I do not know how many people are planning to be alive in the year 2020, but I know I am planning to be here, and I pray to God that my children will be here. But what is it going

to be like if we live in an America where the Federal Government gets \$9 of every \$10 that we earn?

Mr. Speaker, we are not making this up. This was a bipartisan commission that came to this realization. And every day that we wait, every day that we delay, every day that we steal money from our children's pockets to pay off political promises that we have made to the hacks and cronies that lobby us day in and day out is an opportunity lost. And as this country slouches toward the 21st century, as we slouch toward an economic Armageddon that will crush our children's opportunity to have the same shots at the American dream that we had, we miss an opportunity, and we betray those very children that people that get up behind these podiums claim to be so interested in.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not know how to explain it to my children. I do not know how to explain it to friends' children. I do not know how we are going to do it 30 years from now. They are going to ask us: What did you do when you had an opportunity to actually save America? How did you vote? Did you get on the floor? Did you speak against the travesty when the press was ignoring it? When the politicians were afraid to come close to it, what were you doing? And I will have to tell them that, while some of us actually cared enough to stick our necks out on the line and try to make a difference, there are others that simply lacked the moral conviction and the courage and the discipline to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have got to admit right now that I am somewhat ashamed to be associated with some Members of the U.S. Congress, and it greatly pains me to say that. I have only been up here for a few years. I was a middle-class father of two sitting on the couch back in 1994 when I decided I wanted to get off the couch, I wanted to come to Washington and I wanted to make a difference. Nobody knew who I was. I had never run for political office before. I did not come from a wealthy family. I did not have anybody that would bankroll my campaign. I just had ideas. I wanted to contribute to this country. I wanted to save my children from the future that they appeared to be facing because politicians were stealing money from their pockets and from their generation's pockets to pay off their political friends.

So I got involved, and it was not until I got up to Washington that I understood part of the problem. I understood that not only were there politicians that were opposed to the Federal Government living by the same rules that the middle class, where you only spend as much money as you take in, but that there were actually people in this Chamber who would make one promise while they were campaigning for office and then, when they got to Washington, DC, would do what we call the bait and switch, which for the rest

of America is illegal. For the rest of America, if an advertiser does a bait and switch, they get sent to jail.

But in Congress I guess that is OK because there is a Senator back in 1994, who in November 1994 promised that if she got to Washington, DC, again, if she was reelected again, that she would support the balanced budget amendment. Well, she got elected in November 1994, and 6 weeks later she came to Washington, DC.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). Would the gentleman suspend? The Chair must remind the Member that he is to refrain from references to Members of the other body and to direct his remarks to the Speaker.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I was not making references to any specific Member, and I might use this not to address this Speaker, but I must suggest that I am offended by the continued double standard that appears to be occurring in this Chamber where just 2 hours ago a Republican Member was mentioned by name several times and the Speaker did absolutely nothing—not this Speaker, but another Speaker did absolutely nothing when this speaker was mentioned by name several times. And yet when I mention by reference another Member, then all of a sudden I am called down.

I have seen this occur for 3 years, and I am getting a little tired of it—not from you, sir, but from other people in this Chamber.

The fact of the matter is that another Member's name was mentioned repeatedly by a Democrat. I did not hear a Parliamentarian say anything about it, and I counted seven times while watching on TV. I finally had to call the cloakroom to get something done.

I come here today, and I mentioned somebody in the abstract; nobody would even be able to identify this Member that I brought up. And yet my words are called into question. I am not questioning my colleague. I am just questioning what has been occurring for the past 3 years.

I ask for a little fairness and a little evenhandedness. I will refrain from any more specifics.

But I will say that there have been several Members that have made promises on the campaign trail, have promised their people, looking into their eyes: I will support the balanced budget amendment. And then they get elected, and they break their word, they break their oath, and it has happened up here over the past few years time and time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not care whether they are Republicans or Democrats, conservatives or liberals, Senators or Congressmen. All I care about is the impact that these broken promises are going to have on my two boys and on the next generation.

I ask the question, is there any shame left in America when people can just talk out of both sides of their mouth, knowing that the end result will be a future economic calamity for America and for America's children? Regretfully, I have got to say that time and time again we have seen it happening, and it has got to stop.

There is a letter that was written to Members of Congress and was written by the Secretary of Agriculture. He wrote in this letter to Members of Congress: "A balanced budget amendment would in all likelihood set up a fierce struggle for limited Federal resources."

Now let us just examine the words limited Federal resources. Do you know how limited the Federal Government's resources are? Does anybody know how much money we give the Federal Government every year? It is \$1.7 trillion, and where does that money come from? Well, it comes from middle-class Americans who are now spending 50.2 percent of their work year to pay off taxes, fees, and regulations put on them by the Government. It also comes from businesses, from corporations, from people that are creating jobs. Unfortunately, we take it from the dead, we take it from the productive members of society who actually make a profit and create jobs. But in the end, most regretfully, we take it from our children and our grandchildren, and we steal not only from the living but from the unborn, from future generations.

There is nothing limited about the Federal resources that we have, nothing limited at all as we continue to pay farmers not to plant their crops, as we continue in America to pay people not to work, as we continue to shovel corporate welfare across this Nation and across the globe, as we continue to pay for foreign aid.

Just a couple of days ago, weeks ago, decided that we wanted to get involved in family planning and funding abortions across the globe. Do not tell me that our resources are limited. Our resources are not limited. It is our discipline that is limited.

We do not face a deficiency in the wallet, as George Bush said. He had it backward. We face a deficiency of will. We face a deficiency of discipline. We face a deficiency of honor. And if we do not get a handle on this financial crisis that is robbing from my boys and your children and your grandchildren and future generations, they are the ones who are going to have to pay and they are the ones that are going to ask you 30 years from now: What did you do about it? What difference did you make? And you can make a difference; every Member in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, can make a difference. But they are going to have to have a little discipline, they are going to have to be a little less selfish.

I asked for leadership from the President of the United States. In 1994 the President opposed our efforts to balance the budget. In 1995 we put the first

plan in a generation on this floor and passed it to balance the budget for the first time in a generation.

□ 1515

We had a plan to balance the budget in 5 years and to start paying back future generations from the money we had already stolen from them. Yet it was vetoed. We were called mean-spirited. We had a President who said that he wanted to balance the budget, and yet he opposed the balanced budget amendment. Today we have a President who says he wants to balance the budget, and yet he opposes the balanced budget amendment.

We have a President who says he wants to cut the deficit, and yet we have a President who presented a plan that allows the deficit to go up for 3 more years. Yes, we have a President who says he wants to erase the deficit and make that his top priority. Yet the budget he submitted just this month allows the deficit to go up an additional \$40 billion to \$50 billion.

Mr. Speaker, it has taken a lot more than a Democratic President and a Democratic Party and ruinous policies by the liberal Democrats over the past 40 years of controlling this Congress to destroy our children's future. They had to have help. All too often some members of the Republican party were all too willing to help.

I am here to say I do not care whose fault it was in the past. I do not care whose fault it is today. I am saying it is time for people on both sides of the aisle to put their children and grandchildren and future generations' children and grandchildren first, and stop worrying about paying off their political buddies, stop worrying about the good old system that has allowed us to accumulate a \$5.6 trillion debt, and start worrying about their interests first.

This past week we had a vote that I must admit caused me great concern. It seems that the Secretary of the Treasury may have made a \$3 billion miscalculation. That is what at least our leadership told us. They told us that the trust fund was broke because the Secretary of the Treasury made a \$3 billion mistake.

Do Members know what? An interesting thing happened. This time when a \$3 billion mistake was made, for the first time since I have been here over the past couple of years, we had a choice to make. The choice was do we take the money away from the government to pay for this \$3 billion error, or do we take the money out of the American people's pockets?

Unfortunately, we chose to take the money out of the American people's pocket. I voted against it. I think 78 other people voted against it. I can understand some of the leaders' concerns. I can understand that they were promised to have offsets in the future. I can understand their frustration in trying to deal with an administration that says one thing one second and changes

the next time, and trying to pin them down.

But I have to tell the Members what I do not understand. I do not understand why anybody in this leadership would decide that they would take money out of the pockets of the American people because of a mistake that the administration made. That is wrong. It goes against what the Republicans stand for. More to the point, it goes against what America stands for. We have got to start showing a little bit of discipline.

Mr. Speaker, I got attacked in my local newspaper. They said that the Congressman voted against a bill that would have brought \$4 million to his district, to airports that needed the money. That is great. I am not saying that airports do not need the money. I am not saying that my district is not any more deserving of these funds than anybody else. But what I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is whose money is it we are spending?

We have gone beyond just spending the American people's money. We are spending the next generation's money. They are not able to hold us accountable. Until they are able to hold us accountable, until they are of age to vote, I think we have a responsibility to them to preserve for them the American dream that all of us were promised; promised an opportunity by our Founding Fathers, by Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, James Madison, by these great Founders that believed in America, that the individual had the right, had the opportunity, to pursue the American dream.

That is what my parents taught me. They taught me: Work hard, obey the law, respect authority, I know that is radical these days: Respect authority, and you may have an opportunity to do something with your life. That is what I am trying to pass on to my children.

It is not always easy. My father was laid off for a year, 1½ years, and I remember driving around the southeast as he was looking for gainful employment somewhere where he could support a family of five. It was during a tough recession. It was during the energy crisis in the early 1970's.

But I do not ever remember him being resentful. I don't remember him teaching me: You cannot succeed, it is somebody else's fault. What we need, Joe, is more money from the Federal Government. That is why I am out of a job, it is the Federal Government's fault. Or it is the guy's fault down the street, who is more successful than we are. Resent him. Resent his big house. Resent his nice car. It is not our fault, it is their fault.

That is the ethic we are teaching our children. That is the ethic we are teaching America. It is an ethic that will lead to our destruction. We have got to elect leaders who really do not care whether they get reelected or not. They only care whether their children have the same shot at the American dream that they had. For 35 years we

have run up deficits, taken it out of our children's pockets, and basically thrown caution to the wind.

I am telling the Members it is time to stop saying live and let live, eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow you may die, because tomorrow has come. It has come for our children.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the coming year the adults in this Chamber will begin behaving like adults and will look at their children and grandchildren when they go home on the weekends, and when they are going across the districts holding town meetings they will look into the eyes of those members of the next generation that are going to run this country, and say, yes, I care enough to make a few tough votes that may hurt in the short run, but in the long run, will help us all achieve the American dream.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COLLINS]. The Chair will announce, for the benefit of the body, that clause 1 of rule XIV clearly distinguishes between references in debate to other Members of the House, which are in order if not engaging in personality, and improper references to Members of the Senate, which are not in order as a matter of comity between the houses even though not personally offensive, and must be enforced on the Chair's initiative under that rule.

The Chair believes prior occupants of the Chair have consistently applied this rule.

Does the gentleman have a motion?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. No, Mr. Speaker, I actually have a question.

Could the Chair read the first part of that again, regarding references to other Members by name?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Clause 1 of rule XIV clearly distinguishes between references in debate to other Members of the House, which are in order if not engaging in personality.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. If a statement was made of another Member and used this other Member's name, and made disparaging remarks regarding his views on rape, on murder, on incest, and on other matters, would that fall under that section as a disparaging remark?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has clearly stated the rule twice.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Chair has also stated, though, that it has applied it evenhandedly over the past several years. I can tell you just 3 hours ago that rule was not applied evenhandedly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will again remind the Member he has read the rule twice, that there is no prohibition against announcing another Member's name and policies as long as it is not personally offensive to that person, to that Member.

Does the gentleman have a motion?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I will make a motion, but I hope in the future that the Chair will be evenhanded toward both sides.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PICKETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROGAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, on March 5.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. FATTAH.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Mr. SCOTT.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. SANDERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

Mr. CHABOT.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. ROGAN.

Mr. GILMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. EHRLICH.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution approving the Presidential finding that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 518A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 3, 1997, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1951. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; and Import Regulations (Grapefruit); Relaxation of the Minimum Size Requirements for Red Grapefruit [Docket No. FV 96-905-4 FIR] received February 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1952. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Melons Grown in South Texas; Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-979-1 FIR] received February 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1953. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Temporary Relaxation of Size Requirements for Deglet Noor Dates [Docket No. FV96-987-3 FR] received February 21,

1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1954. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Partial Exemption from the Handling Regulation for Single Layer and Two Layer Packed Tomatoes [Docket No. FV96-966-2 FIR] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1955. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Change in Disease Status of The Netherlands Because of Hog Cholera [Docket No. 97-007-1] received February 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1956. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Benoxacor; Time-Limited Tolerances for Residues [OPP-300449; FRL-5583-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1957. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glufosinate Ammonium; Tolerances for Residues [PP-5F4578/R2277A; FRL-5590-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1958. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Spinosad; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-300454; FRL-5590-8] (RIN: 2070-AC78) received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1959. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Temporary Loan Processing Procedures for Insured Electric Loans [Workplan Number 96-014] received February 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1960. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act—Army violation, case No. 96-06, which totaled \$9,500, occurred at Fort Sill, OK, when personnel obligated fiscal year 1995 Operation and Maintenance, Army [O&M, A] funds in advance of an appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1961. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act—Air Force violation, case No. 95-09, which totaled \$622,300, occurred when personnel in the 15th Air Base Wing, Hickman Air Force Base, HI, improperly used fiscal year 1992 Operation and Maintenance [O&M, AF] funds for repairs to the Makai Recreation Center, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1962. A letter from the Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to conduct a cost comparison study of all DOD depot maintenance accounting functions, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on National Security.

1963. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on assistance to the Red Cross for emergency communications services for members of the Armed Forces and their families, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2602 note; to the Committee on National Security.

1964. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on National Security.

1965. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Israel, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1966. A letter from the Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office's 1997 compensation plan, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 1206 (103 Stat. 523); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1967. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Maine and Redesignation of Hancock and Waldo Counties; Maine [ME47-1-6996a; FRL-5693-5] received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1968. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act (ACT) Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD); Louisiana [FRL-5693-8] received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1969. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO-015-1015a; FRL-5682-5] received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1970. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Interim Approval of Operating Permits Program; South Coast Air Quality Management District, California [AD-FRL-5691-3] received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1971. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories: Gasoline Distribution (Stage I) [AD-FRL-5695-9] (RIN: 2060-AD93) received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1972. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Farmersville, Blue Ridge, Bridgeport, Eastland, Flower Mound, Greenville, Henderson, Jacksboro, Mineola, Mt. Enterprise, Sherman, and Tatum, Texas; and Ada, Ardmore, and Comanche, Oklahoma) [MM Docket No. 96-10, RM-8738, RM-8799, RM-8800, RM-8801] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1973. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Streamlining the Commission's Rules and Regulations for Satellite Application and Licensing Procedures [IB Docket No. 95-117] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1974. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Part 36 of the Commission's Rules and Establishment of a Joint Board [CC Docket No. 80-286] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1975. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements [CC Docket No. 92-105] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1976. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption; Sulphopropyl Cellulose [Docket No. 96F-0184] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1977. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's 1996 report of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards on the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Safety Research Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2039; to the Committee on Commerce.

1978. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with France and Germany (Transmittal No. DTC-68-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1979. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Japan (Transmittal No. DTC-65-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1980. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 44th report on the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to international organizations for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 262a; to the Committee on International Relations.

1981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exports to Cuba; Support for the Cuban People (Bureau of Export Administration) [15 CFR Part 746] (RIN: 0694-AB43) received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1982. A letter from the Chairman Pro Tempore, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-529, "Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994 Time Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 1997" received February 26, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1983. A letter from the Chairman Pro Tempore, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-531, "Supplemental Security Income Payment Temporary Amendment Act of 1997" received February 26, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1984. A letter from the Chairman Pro Tempore, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-527, "Natural and Artificial Gas Gross Receipts Tax Temporary Amendment Act of 1997" received February 26, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code, sec-

tion 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1985. A letter from the Chairman Pro Tempore, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-532, "Cooperative Association Temporary Amendment Act of 1997" received February 26, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1986. A letter from the Chairman Pro Tempore, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-528, "Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Safety Regulation Temporary Act of 1997" received February 26, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1987. A letter from the Chairman Pro Tempore, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-530, "Designation of Excepted Services Positions Temporary Amendment Act of 1997" received February 26, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1988. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Review and Analysis of the Fiscal Year 1997 Budget for the Office of Banking and Financial Institutions," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1989. A letter from the Chairman, Armed Forces Retirement Home Board, transmitting the fiscal year 1996 annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act [FMFIA] of 1982, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1990. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1991. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1992. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 1996, through September 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1993. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Mining Claims Under the General Mining Laws; Surface Management (Bureau of Land Management) [WO-660-4120-02-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AC40) received February 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1995. A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the annual report of activities for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1996, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 715b; to the Committee on Resources.

1996. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inshore Component Pollock in the Bering

Sea Sub area [Docket No. 961107312-7012-02; I.D. 021897C] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1997. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; Public Comments on Fishery Management Plans and Regulations [Docket No. 970130016-7016-01; I.D. 012797F] (RIN: 0648-xx80) received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1998. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area; Halibut Quota Share Use Limits in Area 4 [Docket No. 961121323-7027-02; I.D. 111396C] (RIN: 0648-AJ05) received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1999. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Framework 21 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan [Docket No. 970211028-7028-01; I.D. 012397A] (RIN: 0648-AJ34) received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2000. A letter from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Interim Closure of Flatfish Fisheries in Statistical Area 516 of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 021397A] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2001. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 1997 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No. 961126334-7025-02; I.D. 111296A] (RIN: 0648-XX74) received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2002. A letter from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Offshore Component Pollock in the Bering Sea Subarea [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 021997A] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2003. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fishery of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 1997 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 102296B] (RIN: 0648-XX69) received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2004. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Exemption of Freight Forwarders in the Noncontiguous Domestic Trade from Rate Reasonableness and Tariff Filing Requirements [STB Ex. Parte No. 598] received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2005. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Unemployment Insurance Program Letter 05-97—received February 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2006. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issuance Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Rev. Rul. 97-10] received February 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2007. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Timely Mailing Treated as Timely Filing [Rev. Proc. 97-19] received February 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. JONES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KLINK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. KIM, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORBES, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JOHN, Mr. DELAY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 856. A bill to provide a process leading to full self-government for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEUMANN (for himself, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BONO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEY,

Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 857. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of the Social Security trust funds by requiring the Managing Trustee to invest the annual surplus of such trust funds in marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States and certificates of deposit in depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and to protect such trust funds from the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. FALOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 858. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 859. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to eliminate certain regulation of plumbing supplies; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. BROWN of California):

H.R. 860. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Transportation for surface transportation research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 861. A bill to authorize a farmer or rancher whose bid for reenrollment of land into the conservation reserve is rejected to unilaterally extend the contract for a final year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H.R. 862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a decrease in the maximum rate of tax on capital gains which is based on the length of time the taxpayer held the capital asset; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH:

H.R. 863. A bill to establish or expand existing community prosecution program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FROST, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DELLUMS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 864. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the birth of Marian Anderson, to redesign the half dollar circulating coin for 1997 to commemorate Marian Anderson, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself and Mr. TANNER):



H.R. 865. A bill to provide that Kentucky may not tax compensation paid to a resident of Tennessee for services as a Federal employee at Fort Campbell, KY; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 866. A bill to provide that Members of the House of Representatives may return unused amounts from the Members' representational allowance to the Treasury for deficit reduction; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, and Mr. SHAW):  
H.R. 867. A bill to promote the adoption of children in foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 868. A bill to amend title XVIII and title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit expenditures under the Medicare Program and Federal financial participation under the Medicaid Program for assisted suicide, euthanasia, or mercy killing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 869. A bill to require a parent who is delinquent in child support to include his unpaid obligation in gross income, and to allow custodial parents a bad debt deduction for unpaid child support payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARR of California:

H.R. 870. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts to assist the Pajaro Valley Water Management Plan Agency, CA, to implement a basin management plan for the elimination of ground water overdraft and seawater intrusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FROST, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 871. A bill to provide rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for victims of domestic violence to enable such victims to relocate; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 872. A bill to establish rules governing product liability actions against raw materials and bulk component suppliers to medical device manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself and Mr. KLINK):

H.R. 873. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation,

and Liability Act of 1980 to limit Federal authority for response action for releases subject to State voluntary response programs, to provide protection for prospective purchasers of land, and for innocent landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. METCALF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 874. A bill to provide that Oregon may not tax compensation paid to a resident of Washington for services as a Federal employee at a Federal hydroelectric facility located on the Columbia River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 875. A bill to adjust, and provide a procedure for the future adjustment of, the salaries of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MINGE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PITTS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RIGGS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 876. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals to 100 percent of such costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUG (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. NEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 877. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent students called to active duty from entering repayment on student loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of employer-provided transit passes excludable from income and require a cash-out option to excludable parking fringe benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FROST, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 879. A bill to require initial intake screenings and the use of youth development specialists in Federal juvenile proceedings,

and to encourage States and local governments to use similar procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 880. A bill to provide for a reduction in regulatory costs by maintaining Federal average fuel economy standards applicable to automobiles in effect at current levels until changed by law; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 881. A bill to establish a medical education trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STARK, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 882. A bill to reduce the risk of oil pollution and improve the safety of navigation in San Francisco Bay by removing hazards to navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 883. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to simplify credit card payments to governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. GANSKE):

H.R. 884. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the training of health professions students with respect to the identification and referral of victims of domestic violence; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 885. A bill to prohibit any executive branch agency from entering into any service contract if the services procured under the contract can be performed at a lower cost by employees of the agency; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 886. A bill to provide for funding for Federal employee pay adjustments and comparability payments through reductions in agency spending on service contracts for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 887. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to develop and implement a system for determining and reporting the number of individuals employed by non-Federal Government entities providing services under contracts awarded by executive branch agencies; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 888. A bill to amend the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, for fiscal year

1997, to prohibit the contracting out of certain duties; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 889. A bill to repeal various congressionally imposed tax exemptions provided to entities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 890. A bill to provide for special immigrant status for certain aliens working as journalists in Hong Kong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum amount of contributions to individual retirement accounts and the amounts of adjusted gross income at which the IRA deduction phases out for active participants in pension plans, and to allow penalty-free distributions from individual retirement accounts and 401(k) plans for certain purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H.R. 892. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, MS, as the "Aaron Henry United States Post Office"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 893. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased Medicare reimbursement for nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 894. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased Medicare reimbursement for physician assistants, to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 895. A bill to amend section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to improve the housing and counseling program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 896. A bill to amend section 108(q)(4) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to promote regional cooperation in proposed plans for economic development grants; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 897. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in meeting the needs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-

tion for additional facilities, to select abandoned and underutilized facilities in depressed communities; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY (for himself and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 898. A bill to achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and each year thereafter, achieve significant deficit reduction in fiscal year 1998 and each year through 2002, establish a Board of Estimates, require the President's budget and the congressional budget process to meet specified deficit reduction and balance requirements, enforce those requirements through a multiyear congressional budget process and, if necessary, sequestration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 899. A bill to provide funds for child care for low-income working families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. YATES, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CLAY, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MINGE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SABO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STARK, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 900. A bill to designate certain lands in Alaska as wilderness; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. POMBO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HILLEARY, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BONO, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KIM, Mr. CALVERT,

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. METCALF, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HILL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 901. A bill to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DIXON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to authorize the Ralph David Abernathy Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of African-American music to global culture and calling on the people of the United States to study, reflect on, and celebrate African-American music; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. WICKER):

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the right of all Americans to keep and bear arms in defense of life or liberty and in the pursuit of all other legitimate endeavors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a national summit of sports, political, community, and media leaders should be promptly convened to develop a multifaceted action plan to deter acts of violence, especially domestic violence and sexual assault; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia,

Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to commend the National Broadcast Co., and the Ford Motor Co., for broadcasting the film "Schindler's List" in its original, unedited version and without commercial interruption; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 34: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HORN, and Mr. THOMAS.

H.R. 81: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 85: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SABO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 87: Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 127: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 143: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 145: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DELLUMS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 148: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 200: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 203: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 213: Mr. OWENS and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 218: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 231: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 281: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 290: Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 291: Mr. FURSE and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 305: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 312: Mr. COBURN and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 339: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 367: Mr. McKEON.

H.R. 386: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 399: Mr. RUSH and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 407: Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 426: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SNOWBARGER, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 446: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 450: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 466: Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JONES, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. CAPPS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 481: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 482: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 498: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 528: Mr. ROGAN and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 539: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 553: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 563: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. NEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 566: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 574: Mr. OWENS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 586: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEUMANN, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 588: Mr. TALENT, Mr. WISE, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 589: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 607: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. COOK, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 611: Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SABO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FORBES, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FAWELL, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 615: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FORD, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 619: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 630: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 638: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 640: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.

H.R. 674: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 680: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 684: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 702: Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 709: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 716: Mr. NEY and Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 751: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. SKAGGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 753: Mr. DICKS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 755: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 786: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 789: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 791: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 823: Mr. SCARBOROUGH and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.J. Res. 17: Mr. SANDERS and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. COOKSEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. RUSH, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. PASTOR.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. ROYCE.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. YATES, Mr. MINGE, Mr. PETRI, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. DINGELL.

H. Res. 16: Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Res. 22: Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 37: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H. Res. 45: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. FLAKE.

H. Res. 48: Mrs. NORTHUP and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 539: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 615: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

8. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the town council of Bristol, RI, relative to the Pokanoket Tribe of the Wampanoag Nation; which was referred to the Committee on Resources.